

The
Nineteenth Century
And After, vol. -60
1906.

Sas.
Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal

The secret menace alluded to in this postscript is evidently Bonaparte's knowledge of the existence of Louis the Seventeenth, which the writer believes he might make use of (threatening the boy's death), should the Allies enter France. This letter is interesting in another way, as showing Mrs. Atkyns' strong antidemocratic tendencies and love of political intrigue.

She appears to have taken considerable interest in her tenantry; for, on the 25th of October, 1809, she entertained all the people of the village of Ketteringham and, to help them remember the day with additional pleasure, told them they should live rent free for the next three months.

In after years, impoverished by her efforts on behalf of the royal family of France, and obliged to sell Ketteringham, Mrs. Atkyns was constantly in France, and finally took up her residence in Paris, where the sham Dauphins did not fail to approach her. Although she entered into communication with several of the pretenders, amongst them Hervagault, Mathurin, Bruneau, and the Comte de Richemont, she does not appear to have taken them seriously, though she did take the trouble to journey to Gaillon, Bruneau's place of detention. The curious thing is that the pretenders should have sought her but as they did. Richemont in particular wrote that he owed his life to her efforts.

In old age she became much pressed for money, and made constant appeals to Louis the Eighteenth to reimburse her some portion at least of the vast sums she had expended on the Royalist cause. In 1814, on the return of Louis the Eighteenth to France, she made a statement of her claims to the French Ambassador, the Comte de la Châtre, the duc de Bourbon acting as intermediary. The latter in a letter written to her predicted a sure and speedy settlement, 'as her devotion to the most just of causes was so well known.' In December 1816 she did actually obtain a small sum, but, though at first received at the Tuileries, it soon became evident to her that all hopes of recovering any considerable portion of the money she had expended were vain. Put off with excuse after excuse, she nevertheless continued her appeals. The total sum which she claimed to have spent on the Royalist cause was two million three hundred and seventeen thousand five hundred and eighty-four francs!

Certain it is, though this sum may appear an exaggeration, that the whole of her estate was dissipated in the plots and schemes which subsidised with a view to the rescue of the Queen and the Dauphin. It is now known that she it was who supplied funds to the notorious de Batz, and that almost equally daring Royalist conspirator chevalier de Rougeville.

Mrs. Atkyns died in very poor circumstances on the 2nd of January, 1836, in Paris, at No. 65 (now No. 79) Rue de Lille, where she rented a small apartment.

Should any reader of this slight sketch be interested in her curious career, I would strongly advise him to peruse the excellent volume written by M. Barbey, which is full of interesting and hitherto unpublished notes on this remarkable woman. It has as frontispiece a reproduction of the miniature given by her to M. de Verrière, whose house at Parnay was at one time a shelter for many Royalists.

This miniature is to-day the property of the Comte de Lair, whose maternal grandmother perfectly remembered the brave English-woman, her beauty, and her intelligence. One point M. Barbey, however, has not cleared up, which is Mrs. Atkyns' place of burial; for, though he says she was buried at Ketteringham, as desired in her will, such is not the case, there being no record of any such interment in the register.

In all probability the friend of Marie Antoinette—the woman who gave her fortune for the Royalist cause—lies buried without inscription or tombstone in some forgotten corner of a Parisian cemetery.

RALPH NEVILL.

LETTERS OF LORD ACTON TO MARY GLADSTONE¹

THE publication of a new and cheaper edition of this volume furnishes an occasion for reminding many to whom its contents might be precious of their opportunity to hold familiar converse with one of the richest and rarest of minds.

In Lord Acton's eyes a sin almost unforgivable was the restatement of facts already known. Yet I am going to be so bold as to commit the trespass, though I trust not to incur the censure, for now, more than ever, outside a little circle of real scholars and students, repetition alone secures attention, and here is a book which is worth attention.

It is scarcely necessary to invoke authorities to support the estimation in which Lord Acton was held by those who knew him, but the eminent learning of Mr. Bryce and Professor Maitland, their intimate knowledge of Lord Acton, and the beauty and distinction of the language in which they conveyed their admiration of him will justify the quotation of two passages :

He spoke for six or seven minutes only ; but he spoke like a man inspired, seeming as if from some mountain summit high in air he saw beneath him the far winding path of human progress from dim Cimmerian shores of prehistoric shadow into the fuller yet broken and fitful light of the modern time. The eloquence was splendid, but greater than the eloquence was the penetrating vision which discerned through all events and in all ages the play of those moral forces, now creating, now destroying, always transmuting, which had moulded and remoulded institutions, and had given to the human spirit its ceaselessly changing forms of energy. It was as if the whole landscape of history had been suddenly lit up by a burst of sunlight.²

And, again : .

It may seem to some a plain untruth that he was more deeply interested in certain great problems of a philosophical kind than in any concrete presentment of particular facts. They may well have thought of him as the man who, with wonderful exactitude, knew and enjoyed all the by-play in the great drama—at home, no doubt, upon the front-stairs, but supreme upon the back-

¹ *Lord Acton's Letters*. Cheap edition, 7s. 6d.: George Allen.

² *Studies in Contemporary Biography*. Bryce. P. 396.

stairs, and (as he once said) getting his meals in the kitchen ; acquainted with the use of cupboards and with the skeletons that lie therein ; especially familiar with the laundry where the dirty linen is washed ; an analyst of all the various soaps that have been employed for that purpose in all ages and all climes. Disclaiming all esoteric knowledge, and reading only what all may read, I cannot think of him thus. When he was observing, recording, appreciating the incidents, the by-play, he was intent on a main plot difficult to apprehend : ' fatalism and retribution, race and nationality, the test of success and of duration, heredity and the reign of invincible dead, the widening circle, the emancipation of the individual, the gradual triumph of the soul over the body, of mind over matter, reason over will, knowledge over ignorance, truth over error, right over might, liberty over authority, the law of progress and perfectibility, the constant intervention of Providence, the sovereignty of the developed conscience.' Plenty of men are troubled about these matters, plenty of men make theories, ' alluring theories,' about them ; but then they are not the men who know the back-stairs or get their meals in the kitchen, not the men who have toiled in the archives, hunting the little fact that makes the difference. For Lord Acton, so it seems to me, nothing was too small because nothing was too large. The whole lay in every part and particle ; there and there only to be discovered, there and there only to be judged. A conception of history so abstract and so concrete, so unitary and so manifold, so bold and so minute, would have paralysed a weaker man. It did not paralyse him. He worked while the light lasted. But to ' seek a little thing to do, find it, and do it,' to give all his thought to a century, a nation, a fragment—' no, that's the world's way.'

The splendid gifts to which tribute is thus paid were assiduously cultivated. Lord Acton knew French, English, German, and Italian thoroughly, and could maintain without disadvantage conversation in any of these languages with one to whom they were native ; he read, according to a rough estimate, an octavo volume a day ; he knew the most distinguished scholars, politicians, and ecclesiastics of the Continent, as well as of his own country. He was a near relative of Lord Granville, and among the inner circle of Mr. Gladstone's friends. The intellectual aristocracy of Europe acknowledged the depth and range of his learning and the grave charm of his society. De Tocqueville, Waddington, St. Hilaire and Scherer, Dollinger, Laveleye, Von Sybel, Bluntschli, Maine, Henry Sidgwick, John Morley, Sir J. Paget, and many others of scarcely less distinction, were counted among his correspondents and friends. Not one of them, even on his own subject, could wisely neglect a criticism from him or even overlook a hint. Mr. Gladstone accepted a fact from him without question ; and to be in his company, as Mr. Paul truly says, was like being in the best of historical libraries with the best of historical catalogues. I had the privilege of observing him not infrequently in thoroughly congenial society. There, like most great men, he was not above the common focus of humanity, enjoyed the good things of life, liked a gossip, was in sympathy with the eternal feminine, appreciated the one touch of ill-nature which makes the whole world kin ; and yet when the talk grew weightier, he encouraged the timid, flattered the

unlearned, by taking for granted that they understood allusions to remote and unexplored lore, and whilst stimulating by his attention the contributions of all, cast upon the shore of the occasion masses of experience, incident, cross-lights, historical instances, the rich flotsam and jetsam borne thither by the great tides of his memory.

It is true that when he was not in harmony with his company a formidable stillness would descend upon him, and an ambiguous smile would hover about his lips. This watchful and massive reserve affected not the pretentious only, but paralysed the efforts of those who, with Franklin, hold that, as we must account for every idle word, so we must for every idle silence. At Grillion's Club, where he was an honoured member, and where talk is an agreeable obligation, I remember being a party to a conspiracy with an eminent living statesman in an endeavour by the challenge of some hazardous paradox to elicit an opinion from Lord Acton on a doubtful historical question; but Mr. Paul's statement that such an attempt to draw Lord Acton or to make him declare himself upon any doubtful or delicate point was a quite hopeless task was fully corroborated by this unseemly venture.

On another and more auspicious occasion I was present at Hawarden when Mr. Gladstone received Mr. Ruskin, Lord Acton, and Canon Scott Holland, and had the privilege of hearing much conversation, wherein the chief part was taken by Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone, as host, and out of a tender deference to Mr. Ruskin's fragile and venerable age, took a far less prominent part than was his wont, yielding the lead in the conversation to his illustrious guest; nor can anyone who heard it ever forget the incomparable eloquence, imagination, and delicate grace of humour with which Mr. Ruskin acquitted himself. Lord Acton said little, but the men and the occasion were harmonious to him. Now and then an appeal as to a Court of Final Jurisdiction was made to him (never in vain); now and then very quietly he suggested something pithy and profound; one was conscious of an enveloping support; and as under the waters of a tideway over which some great bridge has been built, unseen and massive foundations uphold the structure, so his vast but unobtruded knowledge buttressed the fabric of the talk.

But these reminiscences are by the way, and, indeed, Lord Acton's conversation needs no celebration by anyone who reads the letters before us.

From first to last they are stamped with the hall-mark of intimacy, and partake of the quality of the best talk, refer to a common experience, are pleasantly incomplete, and allude to things not easily fathomed by the insight of a stranger. Hour and circumstance are suited, the converse is struck out of the humour of the moment, and

springs at fit junctures spontaneously from the interest of two minds. Mr. Paul, as editor, has in general, it must be owned, shown no intrusive solicitude to break by explanations the reserves of this delightful *tête-à-tête*. We wander along unfrequented paths, with no guidance or support, remote and unknown figures pass without introduction across the stage, obscure allusions remain unlit; but we must not be ungrateful. Mr. Paul occasionally breaks through his reticence, and we are startled by the scholarly industry which unravels such arcana as 'non equidem invideo miror magis,' and by the historical research of footnotes telling us that Lord Hartington is now the Duke of Devonshire, that the Cairns of 1881 was the first Lord Cairns, and that the old political friend and associate of Mr. Gladstone was the late Duke of Argyll.

The necessary confines of this paper forbid allusion to more than a few of the rich and suggestive topics of the correspondence.

Very early in a reference to his predecessor in the chair of modern history at Cambridge the master note is struck which perpetually sounded in Lord Acton's ears as he pursued his colossal studies. He regrets Seeley's unwillingness to go straight 'at the impersonal forces which rule the world, such as predestination, equality, divine right, secularisms, congregationalism, nationality, and whatever other ruling ideas have grouped and propelled associations of men.' 'All understanding of history depends on one's understanding the forces that make it, of which religious forces are the most active.'

It might perhaps have been expected that the sympathy which great knowledge affords of the varying temptation which each age brings to the actors on its stage, working in combination with Lord Acton's wide experience of statesmen and diplomatists, would have led him into qualifications in his moral judgments of great historical personages. But it was his steadfast view, and he applied it to current political questions, even to those on which he had strong bias, ruthlessly, that 'it is the office of historical science to maintain morality as the sole impartial criterion of men and things.' Thus in reference to Ireland it is good to hear the declaration of so stout a Home Ruler at a time when, in the fierce contest, so many good principles went to the wall,—'takes the line natural to a newspaper and does not distinguish murder from insurrection, a besetting sin of democrats.' I cannot resist quoting from a brilliant and amicable debate germane to this topic, which yet disclosed fundamental differences, carried on in letters between Lord Acton and the late Bishop Creighton in 1887, and set forth at length in Mrs. Creighton's deeply interesting biography. The bishop's attitude to the lapses of great men of the past was distinctly sympathetic.

In studying history the question of the salvability of an archdeacon becomes indefinitely extended to all officials, kings, and popes included . . . selfishness, even wrong-doing for an idea, an institution, the maintenance of an

accepted view of the basis of society does not cease to be wrong-doing, but it is not quite the same as personal wrong-doing; it is more difficult to prove, and it does not equally shock the moral sense of others or destroy the moral sense of the doer.

The men of the past 'are, like himself,' sorely tempted by the possession of power, trammelled by holding a representative position (none more trammelled than popes). Surely they knew not what they did. Lord Acton would have no truck with this view.

Power [he writes] tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men, even when they exercise influence and not authority; still more when you superadd the tendency or the certainty of corruption by authority. . . . The inflexible integrity of the moral code is to me the secret of the authority, the dignity, the utility of history. If we may debase the currency for the sake of genius, or success, or reputation, we may debase it for the sake of a man's influence, of his religion, of his party, of the good cause which prospers by his credit and suffers by his disgrace. Then history ceases to be a science, an arbiter of controversy, a guide of the wanderer; . . . it serves where it ought to reign, and it serves the worse cause better than the purest.

We trace the vitality of this central opinion in Lord Acton's comments on democracy, which have a special interest to us who now for the first time are awaiting the almost unfettered momentum of that force. He perceives, indeed, quite clearly the dangers and weaknesses which beset communities under democracy's sway, and shows in a few strokes how, before it was written, he had appreciated the warnings afterwards conveyed in Sir H. Maine's well-known *Essays on Popular Government*. He had meditated on the perils of a State such as Great Britain without the good securities of stability elsewhere existing, a real veto, a federation of States, a constitution above the Legislature. He is not unmindful of the calamities which may follow the rule of ignorance, yet he is largely reconciled because education, intelligence, wealth, may also go wrong, and every class is unfit to govern; so 'accept the law of liberty which tends to abolish the reign of race over race, of faith over faith, of class over class. It may not be a realisation of a political ideal, but it is the discharge of a moral obligation.'

Many of the letters, as is natural, are concerned with Mr. Gladstone himself, and one of the most elaborate in the volume pronounces a striking eulogium of him, introduced by the epigram, 'the Liberal party consists, like the being which declined a chair, of two wings and a head.' If some may be disposed to think it extravagant, and that the sustained and powerful pressure brought to bear by Lord Acton afterwards on the aged statesman to resist his natural promptings to retirement had some saddening consequences, they may be reminded that he who gave the counsel was no blind admirer. The fine summary—

When our problems are solved and our struggles ended, when distance has restored the proportions of things, and the sun has set for all but the highest summits, his fame will increase even in things where it seems impossible to add to it

—is preceded by a speculation as to what a later generation will feel at an intellect remarkable for originality and independence, matchless in vigour, fertility, and clearness, 'continuing so long shrouded in convictions imbibed so early as to be akin to prejudices, and outstripped in the process of emancipation by inferior minds.'

And, again :

The pride of democratic consistency will aim its shafts at those lingering footsteps, as a scientific age will resent the familiarity and sympathy with Italian thought to the detriment of more perfect instruments of knowledge and of power, and that inadequate estimate of the French and German genius which has been unfortunately reciprocal.

Lord Acton was a strong partisan, using the term Tory as a term of reproach, greatly to Maine's surprise ; but his political views did not lead him into personalities or abuse. Occasionally, however, he breaks into invective of extraordinary vehemence, and it would have been interesting to have obtained from our economical editor some information on his astonishing opinion that Macaulay was 'utterly base, contemptible, and odious,' while yet he admitted him to be 'one of the greatest of all writers and masters.' Literature and tradition might be ransacked vainly to support this censure, but it may be observed that four of the greatest scholars and historians of our time—Mommsen, Harnack, Stubbs, and Creighton—exceeded the praise in their estimate of Macaulay's powers, for at a dinner given by the Historical Society, which Lord Acton founded, in Trinity College, he is reported by a very careful witness to have vouched them all as unanimously and finally agreeing upon Macaulay's name, when the question arose between them who was the greatest historian the world had ever produced.⁴ It is difficult to decide whether the praise or the blame would have the more dismayed Lord Acton's predecessor.

But his temperament was in general judicial. It is good, at a moment when sour malignity so often masquerades in the guise of austere principle, to find that Lord Acton, to whom the policy of Majuba brought 'heartly joy and pure peace,' could acknowledge Sir B. Frere's breadth of mind, was able to disdain people who defamed him, and could quote with approval De Tocqueville's fine saying : 'We must not lower national pride, almost the only elevated sentiment that remains in considerable strength.'

Reference has been chiefly made to the political and historical reflections with which this volume abounds, but there are also here literary criticisms of scarcely less interest. We should have been

⁴ Mr. John Pollock, *Independent Review*, April 1904.

glad to have seen Mr. Shorthouse's defence, or, at any rate, to have heard something of his point of view by way of plea to the formidable indictment preferred against the history of John Inglesant; but this was not to be, and we are left with the indictment only, and this, though written away from books and in a few hours, would require a mediæval historian and a library to check.

George Eliot was most sympathetic to Lord Acton's mind. Like him, she worked always at the main point of view, and strove to penetrate into those things which in systems of religion and philosophy attract powerful minds. She really tried, and succeeded, to think and feel as the men did who lived in the grasp of these systems.

She watched the world through their eyes, feeling their latent background of conviction, discerning theory and habit, influence of thought, and knowledge of life and descent, and having obtained this experience, recovering her independence, stripping off the borrowed shell, and exposing scientifically the soul of a Vestal, a Crusader, an Anabaptist, an Inquisitor, a Nihilist, or a Cavalier, without attraction, preference, or caricature.

But these sporadic gleanings must now be brought to a close. Enough if some faint indication of the wealth which the letters contain has been given. It may be doubted whether any Englishman since Gibbon bore in his brain so rich and varied a freight of learning as he did who wrote them. Certainly no one carried his massy treasure with such easy strength, or distributed it with a more disinterested generosity.

ALFRED LYTTTELTON.

THE MARRIAGE RITUAL OF TOLEDO

MESSRS. POLLOCK AND MATTLAND, in their *History of English Law*, speak somewhere of 'that curious cabinet of antiquities, the marriage ritual of the English Church.' The description is true of the marriage ritual of other Churches besides the English, and it is probably only when we are brought into contact with some outside standard of comparison, such as the ceremony recently witnessed at Madrid, that the interest of our own particular cabinet of antiquities forces itself upon the attention. Alike in its resemblances and its divergences the Toledan ritual serves to illustrate that form of service which, broadly speaking, is common to Anglicans and to Catholics in this country. To touch upon all the points which invite comment would require a treatise, but I trust that in the compass of a few pages it may be possible to throw a little fresh light upon one or two notable features of this familiar ceremony. In the case of the wedding-ring more particularly, and its attendant *arrhae*, not one person probably in a hundred has any idea of the long and intricate evolution from primitive manners which is therein epitomised.

Let us begin with what is best known. It can hardly be necessary to point out that the 'Form of Solemnisation of Matrimony' in the Book of Common Prayer is borrowed (with a few omissions and with the addition of a few new prayers) from the pre-Reformation Manual, or Missal, *ad usum Sarum*. What is perhaps not so generally familiar, the Council of Trent having decreed that in the ritual of matrimony the laudable customs of each country should be retained, Catholics in the British Isles have also remained faithful to the old Sarum forms. Hence it results that in this one matter of the marriage service the Anglican and Roman communions in Great Britain are in substantial agreement, and differ less from one another than either of them does from the *Rituale Romanum* or from the local usages of any other part of the world. When I speak, then, without further qualification of 'our English service,' the reader will understand that I am referring to those features of the rite which occur both in the Catholic and Anglican adaptations as well as in their common original.

In order to get a general view of the whole let us disregard minor

adjuncts and divide the ceremony as found in the older rituals into three sections. By this arrangement we shall have:

(1) The betrothal proper, *i.e.* the expression of consent by the parties who plight their troth to each other before the officiant priest or bishop. This betrothal is generally preceded by some examination or attestation as to the absence of any impediment to the union of the parties.

(2) The bestowal of the ring upon the bride together with money (the *arrhae*). To this act a religious character is given by blessing the objects in question, while other benedictory prayers are added, bringing this earlier portion of the service, originally performed in the church porch, to a natural and orderly conclusion.

(3) The scene being shifted to the high altar, a special Nuptial Mass is celebrated, and a very solemn form of blessing is read over the bride and bridegroom, who are meanwhile covered with a veil or pall.

The first and third of these sections need not detain us so long. With regard to the second, I propose to enter a little more into detail, and for this reason it will be convenient to deal with it last in order.

To those who come to an examination of the Toledan marriage ritual equipped with a fair knowledge of the local usages of other Churches the resemblances between the English and Spanish rite will probably seem more noteworthy than their differences. For example, the first portion of the service in the Use of Toledo, as in the ancient Use of Sarum, is supposed to take place—at least theoretically—in the church porch. Again, it begins with an admonition as to the religious character of the ceremony which is about to be enacted, and this, as in the Book of Common Prayer, is immediately followed by an impressive charge to the bride and bridegroom and to the bystanders to make known any impediment to the union, if such there be, before it is too late. The Spanish rituals repeat the injunction three times, with pauses intervening; and in some cases it appears that a definite answer is expected of the bystanders, or of the parties themselves, before the service proceeds. With regard to the troth-plighting, the Toledan ritual lacks those solemn words, the ‘for better, for worse; for richer, for poorer . . . till death us do part’ (originally, of course, *depart*), which lend so much impressiveness to our English service. The instinct of avoiding long speeches seems to have been strong in the framers of most of the Continental formularies. At Toledo, therefore, in the place of our picturesque marriage vows, the assent of the parties is obtained by three direct questions—questions which seem rather unnecessarily tautological. ‘Do you desire to have this man for your spouse and husband?’—it is the bride who, contrary to all our Northern usages, is interrogated first. ‘Do you consent to be his wife?’ ‘Do you accept him for a husband?’ To which queries she answers in order: *Sí, quiero*

(‘Yes, I so desire’). *Si, otorgo* (‘Yes, I consent’). *Si, recibo* (‘Yes, I accept’). The same questions are then put to the bridegroom, and he replies in identical terms. Whereupon, and this has been in some sense the custom of Toledo from days earlier than the Council of Trent, the officiating priest or bishop at once says: ‘And I, on the part of God the Father Almighty, and the Apostles Peter and Paul, and of Holy Mother Church, unite you in wedlock, and ratify this sacrament between you, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.’

I say that this usage is ‘in some sense’ of ancient date, for previous to the Council of Trent the wording ran a little differently. The priest in times gone by did not say ‘unite in wedlock,’ but *sponso vos* (‘I betroth you’). Moreover, a rubric in the Toledan Manuale of 1554 shows that this earlier part of the ceremony was at first only a ceremony of betrothal, and was intended to be something quite distinct from the actual marriage. This difficult question of the relation of the *sponsalia* to the *solemnizatio matrimonii*, with the attendant problems which have led to so many lively controversies between jurists like Sohm and Friedberg, cannot be treated here, but it is worth while to point out how the traces of this old separation of the betrothal from the solemnization of matrimony meet us at every turn. In the ritual which was used a few weeks back, at the marriage of the Queen of Spain, the Cardinal-Archbishop still asked the bride whether she desired to take Alfonso for her *sposo y marido* by words *de praesenti*, in spite of the fact that in some sense the word *sposo* (which, as here used, means ‘betrothed’) might, strictly speaking, be considered only applicable to the case of *sponsalia per verba de futuro*. In England I am not aware that we have preserved in any of our service books an Order of Betrothal as distinct from that of matrimony, but it seems plain that the troth-plighting which stands at the beginning of the Sarum marriage ritual was *originally* framed with a view to mere betrothal. Where the bridegroom now says, according to the Book of Common Prayer, ‘I take thee . . . till death us do part, according to God’s holy ordinance, and thereto I plight thee my troth,’ the italicised words have replaced what was originally a conditional clause. In the old Salisbury ritual, and in the form still used by Catholics in this country, both bride and bridegroom say: ‘I take thee’ &c. ‘till death us do part, if Holy Church it will ordain, and thereto I plight thee my troth.’

That this clause was, at any rate in some localities, understood as distinctly implying a condition *de futuro* is made clear from the very interesting ritual of St. Omer. This Use as late as 1727¹ provides a ceremony of betrothal which, ‘according to the ancient and laudable

¹ In the case of the neighbouring diocese of Arras we have a still later *Ritualet*, printed in 1757, which provides a form for the *sponsalia*, closely resembling that of St. Omer, immediately before the actual marriage service.

custom of the Diocese,' was to precede the actual marriage. At this preliminary ceremony the priest said :

'N. êtes-vous ici de votre libre volonté pour fiancer N.N. ici présente ? R. Oui, Monsieur.

'Vous promettez donc de la prendre en mariage dans le tems requis et convenable si la sainte Eglise y consent ?'

Thereupon the bridegroom puts his hand to his heart (*manu pectori admota*) and answers :

'Oui, je le promets, devant Dieu et la sainte Eglise.'

After similarly questioning the bride the priest bids them clasp hands, and then, putting his hand upon theirs, he says :

'And I, as a minister of the Church of God, in His name accept and approve this your mutual engagement (*promissionem*); in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

To judge by other rituals, *e.g.* that of Rheims, in which the period is more exactly specified, the *tems requis et convenable* within which the engagement should be carried into effect was forty days, and it was apparently the custom in many places to publish the banns during this interval. All this having been duly performed, the parties again present themselves to be married by *verba de præsenti*; whereupon the priest is directed to say politely to the bridegroom (*dicit sponso, eum urbane compellans*) :

'N. vous promites au jour de vos fiançailles que vous épouseriez N.N. ici présente, si la sainte Eglise y consentoit. La sainte Eglise y consent. La voulez-vous ?'

'Yes,' answers the bridegroom ; or, in Flemish, 'Jae ick.'

When the bride has also said 'Jae ick' in answer to a similar question, the priest bids them clasp hands, and then wraps the clasped hands in the extremity of his stole. Then they mutually pledge their troth in words which approach rather closely to our familiar English form :

'N. je vous prens pour ma femme et mon épouse ; et je vous promets par la foi que je dois à Dieu, et sur ma part de Paradis que je vous serai fidèle mary et que je ne vous abandonnerai jamais, mais que je vous assisterai en toutes vos nécessités autant qu'il plaira à Dieu nous laisser ensemble, comme il le commande et que la sainte Eglise l'ordonne.'

All this is not perhaps so far removed from the subject of this paper as might at first sight appear, for the marriage rituals of certain dioceses, notably St. Omer, Arras, Cambrai, and Liège, which lie in, or on the borders of, the Low Countries, show many points of resemblance not only amongst themselves but with our English Uses on the one hand, and with those of Spain on the other. Without in the least insisting on the point, I venture to make the suggestion that if any future liturgiologist should seek to account for the resemblances which exist in the marriage ritual of the Use of Salisbury and that

of Toledo, it will be worth his while to look for a solution in the direction of Bruges and the Low Countries. But the defective liturgical records of earlier ages make all such investigations full of difficulty.

Be this, however, as it may, there can be no doubt that the use of some previous betrothal ceremony (*sponsalia*) as distinct from the solemnization of marriage was almost universal in the Middle Ages throughout Western Europe. I am inclined to believe that it at first possessed no religious character, and that, when that religious character had been gradually acquired, the *sponsalia* always tended towards amalgamation with the marriage service. This amalgamation has clearly taken place in the ritual both of England and Toledo; but we know, from the direct evidence of the Toledan Manuale of 1554, that the first portion of the service which we have hitherto been considering belongs, properly speaking, to the office of the betrothal.

Let us turn now to the third of the three sections into which we have supposed the marriage service divided. This last portion, as was to be expected, is only imperfectly represented in the Book of Common Prayer. It consisted essentially in the celebration of Mass with a special Epistle and Gospel, special Collects, and above all a long and solemn form of blessing. This blessing is one of the most ancient formularies in all the liturgy of the Church. It is certainly much older than the time of St. Gregory the Great, and it is found in those two venerable collections of Mass prayers which are respectively known to us as the Leonine and the Gelasian Sacramentaries. In spite of all the diversities of local usage, this solemn benediction with its introductory prayer has formed part of the Nuptial Mass almost everywhere throughout Western Christendom. It was employed in all the English Uses before the Reformation, and can be traced back in this country to Saxon times. It still survives in the ritual of Toledo, as in that of Rome; and the Toledan Manuale of 1554, after the introductory *Sursum corda* ('Lift up your hearts') and *Gratias agamus* ('Let us give thanks') &c., prints it with a full musical notation—the solemn chant, in fact, which is distinctive of an eucharistic preface. Whether the nuptial benediction was still sung to this chant the other day at the marriage of the young King and Queen of Spain I am unable to say, but it is certain that identically the same words of blessing were either read or sung over them which were spoken over our English Queens a thousand years ago. They are the same words which were twice at a later date listened to by the unfortunate Catherine of Aragon²—the same as those which consecrated

² Queen Catherine's experience in this matter must have been almost unique. It is a principle enshrined in the text of the Canon Law that a bride who has once received the nuptial benediction must not receive it a second time, if she marries again. But in 1509 it was recognised that Catherine's marriage with Prince Arthur had never been consummated; hence in her second nuptials with Henry she was

that famous mother of heroes, the English Princess Philippa of Lancaster,³ who became Queen of Portugal in 1387 and is an ancestress of the Spanish royal family. In the Book of Common Prayer the greater part of this nuptial blessing is still retained, though it has, of course, lost that exceptional solemnity which is imparted to it by its insertion in the very canon of the Mass. Still, even in the Anglican service its position, at the close of the rite, makes it conspicuous.

O God [so it runs], who by thy mighty power hast made all things of nothing; who also (after other things set in order) didst appoint that out of man (created after thine own image and similitude) woman should take her beginning, and knitting them together didst teach that it should never be lawful to put asunder those whom thou by Matrimony hadst made one: ☉ God, who hast consecrated the state of Matrimony to such an excellent mystery that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and his Church, look mercifully upon these thy servants &c.

In this last word, however, and to some extent throughout the rest of the Anglican prayer, we may notice a change which alters substantially the character of the blessing. The Latin says *respice propitius super hanc famulam tuam* ('look mercifully upon this thy handmaid') (not 'servants,' in the plural). And, indeed, the more carefully the ancient text is examined, the more clear it becomes that this solemn blessing was intended, at least primarily, for the bride alone. As Mgr. Duchesne has pointed out, this aspect of the case becomes quite unmistakable when we look at the wording of the *Hanc igitur* in the Leonine Sacramentary. The Nuptial Mass was, in fact, the consecration of the woman to the married state with its new duties, just as in the Mass *de Virgine velanda* the maiden was consecrated to Christ in the estate of virginity. One is glad to find that in the Toledan ritual the memory of this conception of the early Christian centuries is kept alive by a custom which has unfortunately almost disappeared from the other Churches of the West. In the ancient Leonine Sacramentary the whole Mass is entitled *velatio nuptialis* ('the nuptial veiling'). The putting on of the *flammcum* (the flame-coloured veil) was for the Roman people, even before the Christian era, the most conspicuous external sign of a woman's marriage. This was a change to the outward eye which affected the bride alone, not the husband; and it is not surprising that when the Christian Church consecrated this ceremony by a special ritual it was for the bride that the Mass was offered, and it was upon her, at least primarily, that a blessing was invoked.

Now this special point of view was no doubt to some extent lost permitted to enjoy all the privileges of a maid. For instance, she was married in a white dress with her hair down, and presumably wore no gloves.

³ She was the daughter of John of Gaunt and consequently the sister of King Henry IV. All her children were famous. One of them, Ferdinand, was beatified, and two others, Don Pedro the Traveller and Prince Henry the Navigator, are honoured amongst Portugal's greatest men.

sight of when in the Middle Ages a canopy or pall or veil was extended equally over both bridegroom and bride during the nuptial benediction. This was the case in the Sarum and the other English Uses, and the same custom seems to have been familiar in many parts of France and Germany. But in Spain a distinction is made; the veil envelops the bride completely and covers her head, but it drapes only the shoulders of the bridegroom. This usage is not peculiar to Toledo. The Seville Manuale of 1494 gives exactly the same directions. The veil is to be put over the bride and bridegroom immediately after the Elevation of the Host, and is to cover the bride's head and the bridegroom's neck.⁴ Indeed, we are led to infer from the words of St. Isidore of Seville († 636) that in his day only the bride was covered by the veil.⁵ But, what is even more striking, in the Toledan Manuale of 1554 the priest, at the conclusion of the nuptial blessing, is directed to lay his hand and the book from which he has been chanting upon the head of the bride (*ponat manum et librum super caput mulieris*), nothing being said of the bridegroom. This last rubric has disappeared in the later Toledan rituals, and I am unable to say how far these details were carried out in the recent ceremony at Madrid. It is clear, however, even from the newspaper accounts of the ceremony, that the peculiar custom of the *jugale*, which was described by St. Isidore thirteen hundred years ago, has lasted even to our own day. After the nuptial blessing a band or ribbon was thrown round the married pair, binding them together, and in this way symbolising their union. The later rituals speak of this as a custom not everywhere observed, and they say nothing of the colour of the *jugale* or ribbon. St. Isidore tells us it ought to be white and crimson, the same colours which the rituals assign for the veil.

The only other point which it seems worth while to notice in this portion of the service is the concluding words of the Spanish ceremony—words which, so far as I am aware, do not occur in the mediæval rituals of England, France, or Germany. Taking the bride by the right hand, the priest gives her into the charge of the bridegroom, saying: 'I give you a helpmate and not a slave. Love her as Christ loved His Church.' There have been times in the world's history, no doubt, when such an admonition was not entirely superfluous, even if it be superfluous to-day; and it speaks creditably for the Church's efforts as guardian of morals that in the seventeenth-century rituals of far-off Mexico this same solemn warning was not only preserved but amplified and insisted upon.

And now, turning to the second portion of the marriage service—that which intervenes between the two sections already considered—

⁴ 'Alçado el corpus Christi cubran los novios con un velo, al novio por el cuello y a la novia por cima de la cabeza.'

⁵ *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, bk. II. cap. 20. He tells us that this veil was popularly called *mavors*. He also recalls the act of Rebecca in Gen. xxiv. 65.

we find ourselves confronted by a rather greater difficulty. We can say of the first that it is, as the Toledan Manuale definitely states, only the mediæval betrothal rite slightly adapted for its new position. The third is the consecration, by solemn Mass and special prayers, of that *velatio* or veiling of the bride which was distinctive of the Roman marriage relation, and which is indicated by the very word *nubere*.¹ As for the central portion, I think we shall have to come to the conclusion that it is the resultant of various deeply rooted folk customs, mainly Teutonic and pagan in origin, but Christianised and partly Romanised by contact with the Church. Let us begin with the Book of Common Prayer, in which, after the parties have plighted their troth, the service proceeds as follows :

Then shall they again loose their hands, and the Man shall give unto the Woman a ring, laying the same upon the book together with the accustomed duty to the Priest and Clerk. And the Priest, taking the ring, shall deliver it unto the Man to put it upon the fourth finger of the Woman's left hand. And the Man, holding the ring there and taught by the Priest, shall say : ' With this ring I thee wed, with my body I thee worship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endow. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' Then, the Man leaving the ring upon the fourth finger of the Woman's left hand, they shall both kneel down, and the Minister shall say : ' Let us pray. O eternal God ' &c.

This precise wording has been in use ever since the Prayer Book of 1552, but in the first edition prepared by Cranmer and others in 1549 we notice certain differences, which I italicise :

Then shall they agayne looce theyr handes, and the man shall give unto the woman a ring *and other tokens of spousage, as golde or silver*, laying the same upon the booke. And the priest, taking the ring, shall deliver it unto the man : to put it upon the fourth finger of the woman's left hande. And the man, taught by the priest, shall say : ' With this ring I thee wed, *this golde and silver I thee geve*, with my body I thee warship, and with all my worldly goods I thee endowe. In the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

As was to be expected, the form of 1549 keeps closer to the pre-Reformation Sarum ritual. Indeed, the only two points of moment in which it differs from the older customs are, first, the omission of any form of blessing for the ring ; and, secondly, the change in the manner of putting it on. According to all the English Uses, the ring was put upon the bride's right hand in the manner indicated in the following rubric :

Then let the Bridegroom put the ring on the thumb of the Bride, saying : ' In the name of the Father ' ; on the first finger, ' and of the Son ' ; on the second finger, ' and of the Holy Ghost ' ; on the third finger, ' Amen.' And there let him leave it, because in that finger there is a certain vein which reaches to the heart, and by the purity of the silver is signified the inward affection which ought ever to be fresh between them.

¹ *Nubere viro*, a phrase used only of the woman, means ' to put on the veil for a man.'

² This idea is found in pagan sources, e.g. Macrobius, as early as the third century, and it has thence been adopted by St. Isidore and by the *Corpus Juris*.

Let me add that as regards the giving of gold and silver to the bride, and as to the order to be followed in the ring ceremonial, the Catholic Church in this country has adhered closely to the Sarum rite. The left hand has now been substituted for the right in receiving the ring, but even that change was not made before the middle of the eighteenth century. Our more immediate concern, however, is with the Toledan ritual; and though this in general shows a striking agreement with the old Salisbury Use, still it has some remarkable peculiarities of its own. For this reason it will be well to quote the rubrics of the *Manuale* of 1554 in full :

Then let him [the priest] count the *arrhae*, which ought to be thirteen pieces (*denarios*) ; and when they have been laid upon a plate, together with two rings, let him perform the blessing of the *arrhae* and the rings in the following terms.

Four prayers follow, which it seems unnecessary to quote at length, and then the rubric continues :

Here let the bishop or priest take one of the rings between his three first fingers, saying, ' Bless, O Lord, this ring, that its [circular] form may be a protection to modesty ' : and let him give it to the bridegroom, beginning with the thumb of his right hand, while he says, ' In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—Amen,' passing down through the following fingers as far as the third ; and there let him leave the ring, or on the fourth finger if he so prefer. And in like manner let him take the other ring and bless it as before, and give it to the bridegroom. Then he, holding it with the same three fingers as was done by the bishop or priest, shall give it to his bride in the same manner in which he received his own ring, while the bishop or priest says aloud, along with the bridegroom, ' My bride, I espouse thee (*Esposa, yo te espuso*) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' And the bishop or priest ought to direct him in this, on account of the shyness which on such occasions keeps people tongue-tied. Then let him present the *arrhae* in this manner. He [the priest] must join together the bride's hands below, and then lay on top the hands of the bridegroom, while he places the *arrhae* in the bridegroom's hands, saying (with him), ' My bride, I give you these *arrhae* in token of our marriage (*en señal de matrimonio*), and with my body I you worship (*con mi cuerpo vos honro*), as our holy Mother the Church of Rome enjoins.' Then let her answer, ' I accept them,' and lay them down upon a plate.

After this the wedding party, before the Nuptial Mass is celebrated, move from the porch—where all this has been supposed to be going on—to the entrance of the sanctuary, the priest conducting the bridegroom by the hand, and the bridegroom with his other hand leading his bride. Meanwhile the Psalm *Beati omnes* (Ps. cxxvii., al. cxxviii.) is recited, just as in the Sarum rite. The same Psalm, it may be noticed, is still retained in the Book of Common Prayer, though in the Anglican service the procession is now only made from ' the body of the church ' to ' the Holy Table.'

It would be superfluous to call attention to the slight modifications of this order which have been introduced in the later editions of the Toledan *Manuale*. With very trifling exceptions the descrip-

tion just quoted represents what actually took place in Madrid on the 31st of May last. But a few words must be said about the origin and significance of these two striking features in the marriage service—the *arrhae*, which have now practically disappeared from the Anglican ritual as well as from the Roman, and the wedding-ring, which is almost everywhere retained by Catholics and Protestants alike.

The *arrhae* were a Roman institution, and the word itself, *arra* or *arrabo* or *arrha*, was in use in Roman law. It represented the earnest money or deposit which it was customary for the purchaser to pay down upon fixing the terms of certain forms of contract. If he who gave the *arrha* refused to perfect the contract, he forfeited it; if he who had received the *arrha* refused to perfect the contract, he was obliged to return double the amount of the *arrha*. How far the *arrha*, in connection with the marriage contract among Teutonic peoples, developed out of the Teutonic *lauNEGild*, or how far it was borrowed from the Romans with the spread of Christianity, it is not quite easy to determine.

Closely associated with the *arrha* was the ring (*anulus*). The *arrha* among the Romans, even for any ordinary sale, constantly took the form of a valuable ring, and this happened the more readily because the ring itself was regarded as a token of fidelity. But we know in particular that after a Roman betrothal a ring (*anulus pronubus*) was given to the fiancée—(*et digito pignus fortasse dedisti*, says Juvenal to an engaged man). Possibly other payments were also made concomitantly in coin, but the ring alone pledged the good faith of the donor; and if he failed to keep his engagements by proceeding to actual marriage, the ring was forfeit. In this way we find that the words *anulo fidei subarrhatu* ('engaged by the ring of fidelity') had become a stereotyped phrase amongst early Christian writers, from St. Ambrose onwards. In the famous, though concise, account of the preliminaries of marriage contained in the letter of Pope Nicholas to the Bulgarians in A.D. 866 we hear of the 'betrothal made with *arrhae* through the adorning of the bride's finger with a ring of fidelity.'* How far Teutonic institutions with their *weotuma* and *morgengifu* &c. were able to assimilate this system cannot be discussed here, but we may note that the practice of giving a ring before marriage, either as an *arrha* or as a religious symbol of fidelity, was clearly familiar at an early date to Franks, Visigoths, and Lombards. Thus in the code of Chindaswindus, the Visigoth King (641-652), we read, in connection with a betrothal, of *anulus arrharum nomine datus*;† while Gregory of Tours tells us of a certain St. Leobard who

* 'Et postquam arrhis sponsam sibi sponsus per digitum fidei a se anulo insignitum desponderit, dotemque utrique placitam, sponsus ei cum scripto pactum hoc continente coram invitatis ab utraque parte tradideri aut mox aut apto tempore ambo ad nuptialia foedera perducuntur.'—*Harduin*, v. 354.

† *Leges Visigothorum* (Ed. Zeumer), p. 88.

promised the *arrha* to his *fiancée*, and who seemingly kept the promise by giving her a ring.¹⁰

None the less, though the bestowal of the wedding-ring and the giving of coins seem always to have been intimately associated in the marriage service, I am not sure that we can trace them safely to an imitation of Roman institutions. On the contrary the coins, or the 'gold and silver' of the Sarum Use, may much more probably be connected with the Frankish system of betrothal *per solidum et denarium*; 'as we read that Clovis betrothed Clotilde 'by sending envoys to her father to offer him a solidus and a denarius, as was the custom of the Franks.'¹¹ Moreover, the phrase recurs frequently in connection with betrothals in the early Frankish formularies.¹² Now, although in Merovingian times the solidus was reckoned as the equivalent of forty denarii, this was very soon supplanted by a monetary system in which the solidus was worth only twelve denarii. A solidus (or sou) and a denarius (or denier) might thus be represented by thirteen deniers; and this, as it seems to me, provides an obvious explanation of the number of thirteen coins which was prescribed for the *arrhae* not only in Toledo and Seville but in many dioceses of France,¹³ in which latter country it was often called the *treizain*.

Whichever way we take it, it seems clear that the delivery of coins to the bride must be regarded as originating ultimately in a betrothal ceremony analogous to that of a contract of sale. It is a survival of those ancient days when the bride was bought from her kinsfolk or from those to whom the *mundium* or right of guardianship belonged. Thus in its essence this earnest money was of the nature of an *arrha*, and it may properly be called by that name. Many still extant Anglo-Saxon laws relating to marriage show that even in this country the system of forfeiture for breach of contract was in active operation.

We learn from the newspapers that in the recent royal wedding at Madrid the thirteen coins given by King Alfonso to his bride were gold pieces. It is possible that they are of some antiquity and specially struck for the purpose, being preserved from generation to generation as part of the regalia. Among private families in France many such collections of *treizains* exist, often packed like jewellery in specially constructed leather cases. Sometimes these are coins struck for the purpose, with suitable devices and mottoes;

¹⁰ Vito Leobardi, *M. G. H. Scriptores Merovingici*, i. p. 741.

¹¹ See the so-called *Fredegarius*, bk. iii. c. xviii. (Ed. Krusch) in the *M. G. H. Scriptores Merovingici*, ii. p. 100.

¹² 'Parentibus nostris convenit ut ego te solido et denario secundum legem salicam sponsare deberem.'—*Formula Lindenbergii*, lxxv. Many other examples might be quoted.

¹³ Among these dioceses may be mentioned Rheims—where ten of the pieces were kept by the priest and three only given to the bride—St. Omer, Autun, Arras, Cambrai &c. See an article on the *treizain* in the *Travaux* of the Académie de Rheims, vol. lxxxvii. 1891.

sometimes they are merely ancient pieces which, when made of silver or bronze, have been gilded and put aside for this use. The late M. Poey d'Avant, the numismatist, who formed an extensive collection of these *treizains*, was inclined to think that the usage dates back to Carolingian times.

Finally, the use of two wedding-rings in the Toledan and other Spanish rituals seems to me to favour the view of Dr. Brandileone,¹⁴ that even at an early date the ring among Teutonic peoples is not so much to be regarded as part of the *arrhae* for the purchase of the bride as a religious symbol, emblematic of fidelity, which owes its retention to ecclesiastical influence. It may be pointed out that both in the Pontifical of Egbert and in the so-called Durham Ritual we have a form of blessing for the ring, as also again in the Coronation Order of Queen Judith, the second wife of our Saxon King Ethelwulf. As at this early period we have very little trace of any religious ceremony connected with marriage except the Nuptial Mass, this would seem to show that the blessing of the ring led the way in the direction of a fuller service. Moreover, the contents of these short prayers of blessing do not in any way suggest that the ring was then regarded as emblematic of an endowment. The ring must, indeed, in its origin be regarded as an engagement ring; but it is as a wedding-ring that the Church has adopted it and consecrated it with special benedictions.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

P.S.—Since the above article was in type I have been enabled, through the kindness of the Bishop of Nottingham, who assisted Cardinal Sancha in the marriage ceremony at Madrid, to examine a printed copy of the ritual used upon the occasion. The following points may be of interest to liturgical students:

(1) The Toledan ritual, as described above, was closely followed in almost every particular.

(2) Two rings were blessed and given, as stated,* but the words 'I espouse thee' were not used.

(3) In the procession from the body of the church to the altar the Cardinal did not actually take the King by the hand.

(4) The nuptial blessing in the Mass was read, not chanted, and the celebrant did not lay his hand or book on the head of the bride.

(5) Both the veil and the *jugale* were used as described.

H. T.

¹⁴ See his admirable paper 'Die subarrhatio cum anulo' in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, vol. x. 1901, pp. 311-340.

CONSERVATIVE ORGANISATION AND THE AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS

THE reorganisation of the Conservative party is no doubt an indispensable step towards the recovery of its former efficiency, and all Conservatives therefore must be glad to see that measures are now being taken for reconstructing the party machinery on a broader and more popular basis. We see from the announcement in the *Times* of the 6th of last month that the party managers are now fully alive to the mischief that has been done by too exclusive an adherence to the traditions and methods of the past, when the changes which have been wrought in the electorate should at least have suggested to them some corresponding change in their attitude towards the rank and file. In a word, 'promotion from the ranks' has now become a necessity. There are thousands of voters among the working classes who have done all they could to promote the success of Conservative candidates; and no man, says Johnson, 'is well pleased to see his all neglected, be it ever so little.' It is almost certain, I think, that the cause of Conservatism has suffered among this class of voters from a feeling that their exertions in support of it have not been sufficiently recognised, and from the indifference and discontent which such a feeling, be it well or ill founded, is certain to engender. Efforts no doubt will be made to counteract the effects of this mistake; to bring the Conservative artisan or peasant into closer touch with the local leaders; to sharpen his interest in the political contest by giving him a share in its management, and to raise his self-respect by investing him with new responsibilities.

Lectures, pamphlets, leaflets, may do a good deal in time to efface the misrepresentations which a liberal use of these instruments by the other side has impressed upon the working man. They have penetrated into every country village and into every alley and every yard in our towns and cities. Where they have gone they must be followed. The peasantry must be given the chance, at all events, of hearing one side as well defended as the other. But no doubt the party managers are well aware that the political centre of all rural proselytism lies elsewhere. It is not in the lecture room or the

reading room that the battle is fought. It is in the public-house. The village Solon, giving his little senate laws, with his circle of admirers round him, has more influence than a thousand lecturers. These are the men to be caught and to be employed. Macaulay tells us how the Roman Church would have treated Wesley or Whitfield, and that is how the Conservative party ought to treat the village politician. Give him a post; give him dignity; make him feel that he has a mission. His work will lie among his own neighbours and among people who already look up to him. Such a man as this will be listened to, when strangers might preach in vain. His hearers will know him to be sincere, and will take a pride in a teacher who is chosen from their own ranks.

But, after all, organisation is not everything. 'Organisation,' says Mr. Chamberlain, 'at its best cannot create opinion; it can only secure that it is properly recorded.'¹ Before organisation can do its work we must have something to organise. What is the drill sergeant without his men? What is discipline without an adequate force to give effect to it? The Conservative party wants the raw material—converts and recruits; it wants enthusiasm and conviction among a much larger body of supporters. Mr. Chamberlain, as we know, hopes to rebuild the Conservative party on the strength of a great fiscal reform which shall revive trade and agriculture, and combine Colonies and Mother Country into one impregnable empire able to defy the world. It is a noble vision, but it will take time to realise it, and the present emergency is pressing—indeed, another General Election is thought to be not far distant. There is also another idea, always very attractive to a certain class of minds, which, if capable of being reduced to practice, would, they think, deliver us from the dominion of faddism and self-seeking agitation of all kinds; I mean the formation of a great National party. But how such a party is to be created, while the nation itself is split up into half a dozen different parties, all pulling different ways, it puzzles me to understand. According to my own idea, Conservative reorganisation should be content with what its name implies, and study to build up a powerful defensive party which, if not strong enough to take office, would be able to keep at bay the great Socialist attack all along the line, of which we now hear the approaching footsteps.

It seems to me that, after all the electoral changes which have taken place, Lord Beaconsfield's definition of representation is still worth recalling. In England, at all events, he said, a representative assembly meant the representation of interests. And I cannot help thinking that the surest and soundest basis on which a political party can rest is some great national interest of which it should be the champion and protector. Such an interest in this country is

¹ Letter to Mr. Edward Nettlefold, *Times*, March 8.

agriculture, with which the Tory party has always been associated; and in striving to repair the breach which, partly by their own fault, partly by the 'graceless zealots' who delight to set class against class, has of late years been effected in their ancient connection, the party would be acting in strict accordance with all their best traditions and most natural sympathies.

The demand for small holdings among the agricultural peasantry is, I believe, on the increase, and I find on inquiry that neither District nor Parish Councils have done much to satisfy it. I do not regret their failure, because I should very much prefer to see the satisfaction come from a different quarter. If Conservative reorganisation could proceed hand in hand with a wise agrarian reform, a great work might be accomplished. If the English aristocracy knew the things belonging to their peace, they would take up this question and make it their own while there is yet time. The Socialist party have their eye upon the land, and, unless forestalled by the timely intervention of the present proprietors, may kindle an agitation which it will be very difficult to allay. The example of Russia is not lost upon them, and unless our great territorial magnates can be beforehand with them, and, in boating phrase, 'take their water,' they may expect trouble. But it is not for their own sakes alone that I make this suggestion. The necessity for a powerful Conservative party to oppose those measures of 'a dangerously Socialistic character,' as the Duke of Devonshire described them last March, is becoming more obvious every day. Such a party will be required not only to-morrow and the next day, but for many a long year to come; and I believe it can be formed, if what I will again call the 'Country Party' will bestir themselves, and look facts and tendencies in the face. Let them only regain the counties, and all will go well.

The way to regain the counties is to satisfy the villagers. And for this purpose a large and well-organised system of peasant-farming should be inaugurated by the great landowners. It must not be the work only of a few individuals; there must be a combination of the whole body throughout the kingdom. Every landowner with estates of a certain magnitude should be able to set aside so many acres to be let out in small holdings. If he were a pecuniary loser by the process, he would be a gainer of what is far more valuable in the security which he would purchase for the rest of his property. Such a system as this, inaugurated and kept on foot by the whole landed aristocracy, would bind the peasantry to their natural leaders, checkmate the agrarian agitator, and insure to the agricultural and landed interest sufficient weight in the House of Commons, not only to protect itself from all further assaults, but to protect the other institutions of the country from that combined attack which his Grace of Devonshire—no violent Conservative or panic-stricken alarmist—believes to be at hand. This can only be done, of course, by the formation of

a great Landowners' Association, with a common fund for such expenses as the change may necessitate. The richer ones must pay for the poorer, on the same principle as the equalisation of rates. I am familiar with the objection that landlords could not afford the expense of putting up new farm buildings and homesteads. But it is difficult to believe that among the whole landed aristocracy, from men with half a million a year down to men with five thousand, the money could not be found if all alike were in earnest. They could do it if they liked. We should have an organised combination, embracing the whole landlord class from the Tweed to the Solent, who should take the matter into their own hands and give the labourers what they want, without any legislative interference.

It must be remembered, with regard to the expense, that there are others concerned besides those who depend exclusively on their rents. A very large and wealthy class are directly interested in the preservation of the present land system, though they may not have an acre of their own. All to whom the pleasures of a country life are dear—whether as sportsmen, naturalists, or agriculturists—would lose much of their enjoyment if the land were everywhere cut up into small plots, woods and wastes felled or grubbed up, game destroyed, and the general beauty of English country scenery defaced or ruined. Will they contribute nothing to the cost of an undertaking which may prevent such a calamity as this? There may be other difficulties in the way, apparent to those who are directly concerned with the management of land. But I will not believe that there can be any which are absolutely insuperable, if the landed interest were determined to carry out some such plan as I have suggested, and to sacrifice a certain amount of income, should this be found necessary, in order to preserve the rest. The subdivision of tenancies, as pointed out by Mr. Scawen Blunt, would undoubtedly inflict some hardship on sitting tenants, not to be altogether measured by the extent of their pecuniary loss. But I do not see why this result should be inevitable. As tenancies expired, such arrangements might of course be made without harm to anyone. And seeing that a good deal of land still remains unlet, and that in many parts of the kingdom the old race of farmers are not bringing up their sons to agriculture, there may in time, instead of the demand for small holdings among the peasantry, come to be a demand for small holders among the gentry. I still hope it may be possible for the land-owning class to keep this great agrarian reform in their own hands, notwithstanding that the Radical party claim it as their special watchword. Local authorities entrusted with it seem to have done little or nothing.

And there is still time for the aristocracy to take the initiative. For, mind, it is not proposed to cover the whole surface of the country with a network of small holdings, and to substitute *la petite culture* for *la grande* in all parts of the kingdom. To do so would defeat the

very object which I have in view. If the extension of small holdings on any considerable scale is to be permanent, it must be an economic success. Otherwise its ultimate effect would be only to create, in the second generation at all events, a class of miserable squatters, overloaded with debt and totally unable to cultivate the soil properly. This would infallibly be the result of 'settling the labourer on the land,' as the phrase runs, without regard to his fitness, in obedience to a doctrinaire theory according to which every individual has a right to it. To the compulsory and indiscriminate establishment of petty culture, with the aid of public money, is what I hope the 'party of commonsense,' as Lord Goschen says, will never stand committed. In a few years the recipients of such mistaken bounty would mostly be in the workhouse and their land a prey to thorns and thistles. The system would be utterly discredited, and a reaction would ensue, making small holdings more difficult to obtain than ever. Where not resumed by the landlords, they would be bought up by people who would not be such fools as to let them out again on similar conditions.

All experience and all the evidence collected by the various Commissions which have made this question a special object of inquiry confirm the above. The Report of the Poor Law Commissioners in 1834, of the Commissioners appointed in 1867 to inquire into the employment of women and children in agriculture, and of the Duke of Richmond's Commission in 1880, all tell the same tale. At these three different periods the question of peasant-farming presented itself to a body of thoroughly competent inquirers in exactly the same light. Since the last-mentioned date I have made frequent inquiries myself in different parts of England, nearly always with the same result. In grass and dairy districts, which only form a small part of agricultural England, a man of average skill and intelligence may do pretty well on a farm of six or eight acres; and in the arable districts, or where grass and arable are mixed, he can make a small farm answer where he has some supplementary industry to fall back upon. In any ordinary village it will be found that it is the butcher, the publican, the blacksmith, or the carrier who prospers on five or six acres. But where none of these conditions exist, the successful man must possess qualifications not always found united in the average peasant. Skill, industry, frugality, and self-denial will enable an agricultural labourer in most parts of England to save a little money; his character will gain him credit for more, if he requires it, without having recourse to the money-lender, and then he may invest his little capital in a small farm with a reasonable prospect of thriving on it. Lord Wantage, who has been trying the experiment on a large scale at Lambourn, in Berkshire, gave us, twenty years ago, a very interesting account of the kind of man who makes peasant-farming pay.

He is a man who came from the North of England, where he saved money as an agricultural labourer. He has got seventeen acres, and is able to pay a good rent and redeem his land gradually at the same time. He has built his own house at the cost of 75*l.*, a cowhouse and a shed besides, and has fenced in his little property, which now bears four acres of good barley and four of oats, there being grass enough for a dairy and a stock of poultry which bring him in 1*l.* a week. He will sell his corn for 50*l.* or 60*l.*, and in his spare time he works on the road for 12*s.* a week.

This, of course, is an exceptional case; I do not mean that only such men as this one can be entrusted with small farms. But they should at least be reserved for men who have proved, by their previous career, that they do possess in some measure the qualities essential to success.

And even so they can only be farmed at a profit under certain conditions. The average small holding should be no larger than a man can cultivate by himself with the help of his family, and without the expense of a horse. Such a man, however, is heavily handicapped at present by the claims of the schoolmaster. His boys should be free from school at thirteen at the latest, whether they have passed any required standard or not, and we should say that twelve would be a still better age. An intelligent boy is being educated all the time he is at work in the fields. He is learning his business, and what equivalent for this untaught wisdom he obtains by being kept at school till he is fourteen I have never yet been able to ascertain. The holder of a small farm who begins with a little capital and has the labour of his family to help him, who is also a man of more than average ability and industry, may be able to hold his own against bad seasons and accidental losses, by which the less qualified peasant-farmer is sure to be overwhelmed. There is a class of Liberal or Radical reformers who will not see that you cannot eat your cake and have it. You cannot keep the boy at school till he is fourteen, and fulfil all the necessary conditions of peasant-farming at the same time. You must moderate your zeal in one direction or the other.

All the evidence which I have been able to collect² at intervals of forty, twenty-five, and thirteen years, coming down to the present date, forms an overwhelming mass of testimony to the failure of small farmers who have nothing else to depend upon, either to make a decent living for themselves or to cultivate the land efficiently. No really honest reformer who has the welfare of the peasantry at heart would wish to reproduce in every English county the statesmen of Cumberland or the petty proprietors of Axholme. They vegetate, they cling to their little freeholds, but they live miserably, with few of the comforts, or sometimes even decencies, of ordinary domestic life. All the reports to which I have referred agree that wherever peasant-farmers or peasant-proprietors

² *Agricultural Labourer*, by T. E. Kebbel, 1893. (Swan Sonnenschein & Co.)

are found in England now wholly dependent on their land, their farming is bad, their mode of life wretched, and their debts 'crushing.' The evidence on which these reports are based is said by some of my more recent informants to be inadequate to support them. I hear from Lincolnshire that the Axholme proprietors are not so badly off as the Commissioners represent them. But, on the whole, the preponderance of testimony to the failure of peasant-farming in England, where not combined with some supplemental industry, is too great to leave any doubt of what should be our general conclusion.

Nor is its probable effect on the condition of the peasantry themselves the only thing to make us pause. The establishment of the petty culture system, as contemplated by one class of agrarian reformers, of whom many no doubt sincerely believe in it as the only solution of a great social problem, could only be effected at a cost which they may not perhaps have calculated. It must necessarily involve the gradual, if not the speedy, extinction of the ordinary tenant-farmer as we now know him, and the destruction of a very valuable link in the social chain, which we should deplore when it was too late. Consider the effect of withdrawing from every village in England the five or six men of capital and intelligence who now rent the land. More than that. If we have no tenant-farmers to fill parochial offices, the want of them must be supplied by Government officials, and thus our whole system of local self-government would be destroyed at a blow.

In order to prevent the suggestion here advanced from being banned as utterly unpractical it was necessary to show within what limits its operations would be confined; and to this end it was further necessary to show that to extend small holdings to the peasantry indiscriminately—to create, that is, a large population exclusively dependent for their livelihood on a few acres of land—would only be a cruel kindness to the majority and a great injury to the public, not only by the extinction of a valuable class of society, but by the deterioration of the soil which must inevitably follow. The Landowners' Association therefore would not be called upon to take up the visionary schemes of Socialistic enthusiasts whose zeal, whether real or affected, is considerably in advance of their knowledge, but only to provide for the legitimate aspirations of men qualified to succeed in the position which they desire to occupy. In every parish or lordship in England there are probably to be found among the peasantry a few such men, and if on the estate, of which the parish formed a part, a few hundred acres were cut up, as opportunity offered, into small holdings ranging from ten to fifteen acres, I think the labourers would be satisfied; for they would all see a future before them—the possibility of rising by their own exertions into a higher sphere—a possibility which is one of the great attractions of the town. A man does not rise from a shopboy to be a shopkeeper

without serving his time at the counter, or practising the economy and acquiring the knowledge which are necessary to give him his chance. It is a question, after all, of the survival of the fittest. The peasant must take his chance with other working men. He must fight his way to a farm as others fight their way to a shop, by the exercise of the same virtues; and this being thoroughly understood, a good deal of the difficulty described by Mr. Scawen Blunt would disappear.

Mr. Blunt in his interesting article refers to the condition of *la petite culture* in foreign countries, and all that he says goes to show that no great change has taken place in it since 1893, when my latest inquiries were made. Two gentlemen were appointed in 1880 to report on the condition of agriculture in France, Holland, and Belgium, and they say in their reports what Mr. Scawen Blunt says now. Continental writers on the subject say nothing to make us doubt its substantial accuracy. Dr. Voelcker, M. Laveleye, M. Lavergne, M. Foville, though not all agreeing as to the exact condition of the peasant-farmer, say quite enough to show that his condition on the whole is inferior to that of the English agricultural labourer; while those who speak in favour of the system as existing on the Continent give us clearly to understand that in their opinion it would be a mistake to introduce it into England. M. Laveleye, who is an advocate of *la petite culture* in his own country, nevertheless prefers the English system in the abstract. He suggests, what I myself suggest, that a larger admixture of small farmers with large ones might be beneficial; and that is just what I wish to see recognised by the landed aristocracy, who for their own sakes, if for no other reasons, should come forward as the voluntary inaugurators of the new *régime*, and not wait till it is forced upon them from without.

I think, if the work of Conservative reorganisation could be carried on in connection with a wide and well-considered scheme of agrarian reform, under the direction and management of the great body of landed proprietors, our rural troubles would be approaching a termination. And with these how many others! The thorough and hearty reconciliation of these ancient friends, the peasantry and the gentry, would mean the desiccation of other social sores. With the whole landed interest presenting one united front in defence of our national institutions, the party of destruction, however honest their intentions, could make but little progress. They cannot object to being so called, as some prominent members of the Labour party have recently announced that their policy is to 'destroy' landlordism, denominationalism, and whatever other 'isms' stand in the way of that English Utopia which is eventually to reward their exertions. And when I speak of the whole landed interest I do not mean only the actual proprietors and cultivators of the soil. There are, I have already said, hundreds and thousands of Englishmen only less deeply

interested in the maintenance of our territorial system than the gentry and nobility themselves. This is not a question only of squires and rectors, of Dukes and Earls. There is a great body of wealthy men, lying outside of the territorial class, who are, nevertheless, indebted to it for some of their greatest pleasures and most healthy recreations. Lawyers, merchants, doctors, professional men and men of business, who have worked hard for their money, all hasten to spend it on such enjoyments as without the existence of large estates would be unattainable. The London banker should consider how much he is concerned in keeping together the acres of the Yorkshire baronet. The landed interest, for the purpose now under consideration, extends over a very wide area—legal, commercial, medical, and into the regions of literature and art. The system as it now exists affords, through field sports, the best possible training for our officers. From almost every point of view the abolition of large estates would be a national disaster. No system is without its abuses. Some properties may be too large. But I am speaking only of the general principle. I have no space to enlarge on the moral and social influence, on the practical usefulness and gratuitous public services, of the English aristocracy. Mr. Gladstone has done that once and for ever. And I ask again: Should not every motive of patriotism and self-interest combine to urge on the holders of this great position the wisdom and the duty of making some sacrifice to secure and perpetuate it? Let them, I repeat, once regain the counties, and their future is secure.

A political party deserving of the name should not be dependent on the fluctuating incidents of the hour; on the popularity of this or that question, or this or that temporary gust of passion. It should rest, if possible, on some solid principle, on some great national interest which raises it out of the sphere of ordinary party cries and remains unaffected by controversies of the second class. In the eighteenth century, and down to the middle of the nineteenth, both Whigs and Tories, or Liberals and Conservatives, represented respectively two great national interests. But neither of them does now, and I think Conservative reorganisation should be directed towards the recovery of such a position as this for the defenders of what millions of Englishmen so highly value. It does not seem as if in adopting any such scheme as I have here suggested the landowners need part with any of their property unless they like. In various parts of England the peasant would rather rent a farm than purchase it; and if what I have ventured to indicate could be fully carried out, his landlord could afford to be an indulgent one. We must be prepared for a crisis, which, though it may not lie in the immediate future, is, humanly speaking, certain to be upon us at no remote date. The land question promises to be the next great question raised when the education controversy is either settled or suspended. Should a change of Government cause the whole Radical programme to be deferred for

some years, it will not have been abandoned, and the aristocracy would be wise to employ the interval in strengthening their own position and making themselves ready to meet it when it once more reappears. When that time arrives, I sincerely hope that it may find the whole landed interest—gentry, yeomen, and peasantry—united and organised, knit together not by the bonds of feudal authority or legal mastery, but by habits of kindly intercourse, generous consideration, and the revived force of old associations and gracious charities.

T. E. KEBBEL.

CONFLICT OR COMPROMISE?

THE opposition to the Education-Bill on the part of Churchmen has been strong and unanimous beyond expectation. Hitherto, however, it has not been of a kind which contains any assured promise of success. To many this will appear a wholly unwarranted doubt. They will not admit that there is room for two opinions upon the manner in which the Bill is to be dealt with. For an example of resolute and unmistakeable utterance on this point I take the close of the Bishop of Manchester's speech at the Lancashire Demonstration in the Albert Hall :

Because this Bill had insulted their Church, outraged their sense of public morality, and threatened their religious liberty, they would not have one line of it, they would reject it all from the first clause to the last ; they would bid the Speaker pitch it into the Thames and turn the attention of Parliament to some more useful legislation.

The Bishop apparently thinks that the House of Commons will itself issue this mandate to Mr. Lowther. Mr. F. E. Smith, who followed him, was less sanguine. The House of Commons, he concedes, may possibly pass the Bill with very few amendments. But the House of Lords remains, and there remains also the appeal to the country which the House of Lords can compel the Government to make. Of these two readings of the future Mr. Smith's is probably the more accurate. There are no present signs of an impending Ministerial defeat in the House of Commons. That the Lords may either reject the Bill on the second reading or, by magical arts in Committee, bewitch it into a changeling which Mr. Birrell will refuse to acknowledge, is possible—it may be more than possible. In either case the Bishop of Manchester will have had his way in part and the Bill will have been rejected from the first clause to the last. But will this result be the solid victory that the Bishop expects it to be ? That for the moment it will be a triumph of the first order no one can deny. To have thrown out the chief Government measure in the first session of a new Parliament, and that a Parliament in which Ministers command an unexampled majority, might well turn the heads of any Opposition. But what about the duration of the triumph ? What about its value as a contribution to the ultimate settlement

of the question? Even if the Bishop of Manchester's prophecy proves true to the letter, and at the bidding of a repentant House of Commons the Speaker goes in procession to the wall of the Terrace and pitches the Bill into the Thames, I greatly fear—the Thames being a tidal river—that the burden thus committed to its waters will only be carried to and fro between the two palaces of Westminster and Lambeth. Will this satisfy Churchmen who wish to see the religious difficulty, and with it the whole question of elementary education, cease to be a matter of political controversy? It is but a limited outlook that is contented with an isolated success. The wider view takes into account the legislation that is to follow as well as that which is cast on one side as worthless. Those who look to the Lords for help must take what help the Lords give them, and the Lords, left to themselves, will give them whatever they think will best advance the interests of the Conservative party. I do not blame them for doing this. Politicians naturally put politics first. But Churchmen will do well to bear this in mind when they are asked to trust themselves to the guidance of political allies. If they allow the Lords to frame amendments for them they will have no right to complain if they find themselves committed to dangerous concessions or profitless demands. To discredit a Government is an easier, and to politicians a more tempting, achievement than to devise a compromise which shall sacrifice no principle and give occasion to no resistance.

These objections will not, it is true, apply to a rejection of the Bill on the second reading. In that case no alternative scheme need be put forward. The question will remain where it was before the January elections. But ought the maintenance of the *status quo* to be a matter of rejoicing to Churchmen? Have they found the relations between Church schools and the Local Authorities so satisfactory that they need only ask to have them made permanent? Will they be content, after all that has been said in petitions and at public meetings about the right of entry into Provided schools, to see them remain close undenominational preserves? Even if their love for things as they are goes these lengths, what chance have they of being permitted to indulge it? The objections to the Act of 1902, of which so much was heard six months ago, are not wholly imaginary. Passive Resistance is a fact, and, unless it is to remain a fact, the financial basis of the Act of 1902 must be changed. Even if the fondest hopes of the opponents of Mr. Birrell's Bill are realised, and it and the Liberal Government disappear together, the Education question will be still with us. The next Cabinet will not, any more than its predecessors, be able to let it alone. Mr. Balfour will again undertake the preparation of an Education Bill, and the question will once more be in the hands of the party which insisted on the adoption of the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, and values Church teaching in

proportion as it is indistinguishable from undenominational teaching. I am not even sure that the zeal for parents which is so marked in the opposition to the Bill at this moment would survive a change of Government. Mr. Cripps indeed makes the assertion of 'the inalienable right of parents to select that form of religious teaching which in their heart and conscience they believe to be best for the spiritual needs of their children,' a main ground of his opposition to the Bill. This new-born faith in the 'inalienable right' might well have been accompanied by some signs of repentance for the years during which it has been ignored. Lancashire was all-powerful with the Government which framed the Act of 1902, but that measure made no mention of parents. In every single school area they were left to choose between having their children taught the religion of the Foundation Managers and leaving them, so far as the school went, without any religious teaching at all. I rejoice at the change which has come over Churchmen in this respect. Adversity has proved a wholesome teacher. But I should like to see them rather more conscious how complete a change it is.

If, then, any good result is to come of the opposition to Mr. Birrell's proposals, it must come by way of amendment rather than of rejection. Is there no compromise which the Government might be disposed to accept rather than risk cutting short the life of the infant Parliament? Such a compromise must face without flinching the actual facts of the situation. It must rest on intelligible principles and not give needless offence to other people's principles. It must command an amount of Church support large enough to gain the attention of politicians, and it will be an additional merit if it has already commended itself to politicians on the score of its intrinsic reasonableness. I cannot hope that such a compromise will be regarded by any one as the absolute best among settlements. Its chance of acceptance lies in the circumstance that all parties may in the end come to see that it is a workable second-best.

The only plan which promises to combine these advantages is that indicated by Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons on the 22nd of May, and advocated by the Bishop of Birmingham in the *Times* two days later. I say 'indicated' by Mr. Chamberlain, because the amendment which he actually moved dealt but with one part of the plan. The other two parts were only foreshadowed in his speech. But the part actually included in the amendment is the important and essential part of the scheme; the remainder is rather in the nature of inducements devised to facilitate the adoption of the first. The whole scheme, as explained by its author, would consist of the following clauses:

(1) No school shall be recognised as a public elementary school unless provision is made that religious instruction shall not be given at the public expense.

(2) Free entry into all schools shall be secured to all denominations (including the supporters of simple Bible teaching) for the purpose of giving religious instruction in school hours.

(3) For this purpose the teachers shall be allowed, if they wish it, to give their services to any denomination that is willing to engage them.

This is the compromise so far as Mr. Chamberlain has sketched it.

The one supreme merit of this scheme is its full recognition of religious equality. The State is placed in a position of absolute impartiality towards all creeds. This impartiality implies no unfriendliness to any. The State does not deny that the teaching of religion is a good thing. It simply acknowledges its own inability to make provision for it. But it sets no obstacle in the way of the various religious bodies making this provision for themselves. On the contrary, it lends them school rooms in which to give the instruction, and it compels parents to send their children to receive it, except in the rare case of parents who belong to no religion and do not wish their children to be taught any. No other plan but Mr. Chamberlain's—except of course the purely secular plan—accepts this principle both generally and in detail. Mr. Birrell declares this religious equality to be impracticable. He proposes to establish and endow simple Bible teaching and to place all other varieties of teaching in an inferior position. But the believers in the religions represented by these varieties of teaching are just as much Englishmen and citizens as the believers in simple Bible teaching, and if they are called upon to pay for the exclusive establishment in the schools of a religion which is not theirs, their protests cannot be passed over without risk of public inconvenience. Mr. Birrell disposes of this inconvenience with a phrase: 'minorities must suffer.' The *Spectator* and the *Westminster Gazette* argue that there is no evidence that any appreciable number of persons object to this singling out of simple Bible teaching for exclusive recognition by the State. To Mr. Birrell I can only reply that, though minorities must suffer, they are sometimes found to have the power of causing a good deal of annoyance to the majority which makes them suffer. The *Spectator* and the *Westminster Gazette* have a right to say that the minority is an unknown quantity. So were the first passive resisters. The strength of a minority is not simply a question of size. It is a question of determination in those who make up the minority and of the extent to which their action will influence others. No one, I think, will deny that the principle of equality has made great progress since the introduction of Mr. Birrell's measure. In word, at all events, it appears in almost every Anglican protest. Whether, indeed, the protesters quite realise the meaning of their own language is another question. To me it seems plain that the maintenance of separate Church schools as an ordinary factor in an educational system would

make any adequate provision for religious equality very difficult. Mr. Cripps, speaking at the Albert Hall, demanded for 'all creeds and all denominations equal and the same facilities in reference to religious education.' So far we are agreed. But then he defines this equality as the right of the poor man equally with the rich man to have a school of the sort which, if he had his own free choice, he would select. No doubt this plan does secure religious equality, but it does so at immense cost. If I understand Mr. Cripps rightly, he would set up separate schools for all minorities which desired them. There is nothing I should like better. But if this is to be done out of the rates the ratepayer may take a different view. I do not know Lancashire, but I can hardly be wrong in assuming that its population contains a Nonconformist as well as a Church element. If every Nonconformist parent is to be able to send his child to a school of the sort which if he had his own free choice he would select, it is difficult to believe that he will always choose a Church school. He will be more likely to prefer either a school belonging to his particular denomination, or a school in which simple Bible teaching is given. While, therefore, this arrangement would be excellent in principle, in practice it would mean that, even in Lancashire, there would have, in hundreds of cases, to be two or even three schools where there is now one. At present, it may be, the Nonconformist parent contentedly avails himself of the Church school. But we have no right to infer that he would go on doing this when he understood that Parliament had given him the right to have a school such as he would choose if left to himself. I am as much an enthusiast for religious equality as Mr. Cripps is, but I cannot think that to put the demand for it in a form which would double, and more than double, the cost of education is the surest way to get it conceded. At all events, Mr. Chamberlain's plan avoids this difficulty. The provision of universal religious instruction will cost the State nothing.

The advantages of Mr. Chamberlain's plan are not to be found only in the provisions which it would introduce into the Government Bill. They are equally visible in the provisions which it would render unnecessary. The first clause would of course remain. If any one is of opinion that this can be got rid of he seems to me to put wishes in the place of facts. There is room for much difference of opinion as to the precise extent of the mandate which Ministers are supposed to have received from the country, but, unless the last election was an illusion, they were returned in the belief that they would abolish the dual system. Of one thing at all events I am convinced. If Church schools are to be retained as a separate element in our educational system the price we shall be compelled to pay will be the abandonment of our claim to teach Church children in Council schools, and that is a price which would involve the surrender of a demand which the Church, happily, has at last made her own. *Clauses II., III.,*

IV. and VI. would disappear. When the State no longer paid for a particular kind of religious teaching, and when all kinds of religious teaching were admitted into all schools, there would no longer be any need for a transfer of schools, except as a matter of local convenience or for the adjustment of the rival claims of denominational and undenominational instruction. The two would go on side by side in every school. For Clause IV., however, a substitute would have to be provided, and this would be found in the plan which has already been put forward in quarters so opposed on other points as the *British Weekly* and the *Spectator*. It is the plan of allowing schools to contract themselves out of the Act, provided that they are willing to forego all claims upon the rates and to make themselves responsible for a fixed proportion of the cost of maintaining the school to the satisfaction of the Board of Education.

I pass to the objections which these proposals will have to overcome. I will first take that which will certainly be raised by very many of the clergy. 'Thank you for nothing,' they will say. 'How is the Bill as thus amended better than the Bill as drawn? In each case we lose our schools.' That the Church schools go equally on either plan is of course true. But let us look at the manner of their going. Under the Bill undenominational teaching is ostentatiously preferred to Church teaching. The one is to be given as a matter of right, the other is to be given as a matter of arrangement. The one is to be given in all schools hereafter to be built, the other is to be given only in schools already existing and transferred. The one is to be given to all children not withdrawn under the conscience clause, the other is to be given only to children whose parents expressly ask for it. The one is to be given by the regular teachers as part of their regular work, the other is to be given by volunteers. In the one case the undenominational teachers will be paid by the State, in the other they will be paid by voluntary subscription or not paid at all. Here are five points in which the two systems are absolutely unlike, and I submit that, taken together, they make the whole difference between a tolerable and an intolerable settlement.

Nor is the scheme one which can altogether please those who desire to see the State entirely dissociated from the teaching of religion. They will welcome the first of Mr. Chamberlain's proposals, but they will have grave doubts about the second and third. I share these doubts myself. I believe that in the end religion will be better taught, and taught with better results, if the State does no more than allow the several varieties of religious teaching desired by the parents to be given in the school building. I am afraid that if attendance at these lessons is made compulsory, the Church of England, as being the Established Church, will be exposed to a kind of interference which non-established Churches will not provoke. I am afraid—and this I feel more strongly still—that so long as the services of the regular

teachers can be secured for the religious lesson the clergy will not make any adequate effort to regain, and to qualify themselves for keeping, their proper place in the religious training of children. I am so impressed, however, with the danger of the exclusive establishment of Undenominationalism in the State schools, and with the necessity of disposing of the religious difficulty in some way which shall prevent its recurrence, that I would far rather see Mr. Chamberlain's plan adopted than wait for that more complete dissociation of the State from religious teaching which I feel sure will follow if it be not adopted. I am afraid of the temper which might animate this dissociation if it followed upon a long and embittered conflict. In that case the victory of secular schools might be regarded, when it came, as a triumph for the principle of secularism in education. That is not the principle for which the Churchmen who desire secular schools are fighting. They regard schools established on this footing simply as a convenient method of assigning to the secular and religious elements in education their separate places in a common system: Secular teaching to the State; religious teaching to the Churches. To Churchmen like Mr. Masterman, who dislike the concessions which their acceptance of Mr. Chamberlain's scheme would involve, I would commend the following extract from a letter I lately received from a London clergyman who has had great experience both of Church and of Board Schools:

My great object [he writes] is to get rid of State-paid Undenominationalism. I conceive that can only be done by insisting on the State confining itself entirely to the secular part of education. The more I think of it, the more I feel that State compulsion is bad for religion, but apparently that is not the opinion of the Liberal party nowadays any more than it is of the Tories. I would, therefore, accept 'in school hours' if I cannot retain Clause VI. Anything would be better than the retention of 'my school,' with its necessary consequence—that the children in Council schools would continue to be neglected.

This exactly describes my own position, and the position, as I hope, of a constantly increasing number of Churchmen.

To a large and influential body of laymen Mr. Chamberlain's compromise will be distasteful on two grounds. Some of them wish, as a matter of principle, to see simple Bible teaching established in State schools; others are afraid that if the teaching of religion is left to volunteers simple Bible teaching will cease to be given, and so the residuum—the children, that is, whose parents belong to no religion—would lose their one chance of religious instruction. The believers in a State conscience, a conscience which imposes a specific religious obligation, I cannot hope to convince. With the second objection I have more in common. I am not prepared to say that it would be better for a child to have no religious teaching at all than to have Bible teaching only. It all depends on the teacher. But

I do not think that under Mr. Chamberlain's plan there would be the least danger of children growing up in complete ignorance of religion. I believe that there are very few parents who would not wish their children to have some religious instruction, and that even in these exceptional cases the child's preference for the easier lesson over the harder,—for religion over arithmetic—would be too strong for the parents' austere agnosticism. But by whom is this teaching to be given? The denominations, it is urged, can be trusted to find teachers for themselves, but in this respect the friends of simple Bible teaching will be unorganised and helpless. I think that those who thus argue forget their own contention that this simple Bible teaching is what the majority of Englishmen wish to see given in every school. If that is so—and I have no intention of denying it—there would surely be no difficulty in finding volunteers in all classes ready and anxious to give it. All that would be needed would be the creation of central and local associations to make registers of schools in which this teaching was wanted, and of teachers who were willing to give it. In schools, indeed, that have all along been Council schools, simple Bible teaching would at starting have an advantage over all others. The regular teachers would have been accustomed to give it, and they would naturally volunteer to go on giving it.

There remain the objections which, as there is great reason to fear, the Nonconformists will urge against Mr. Chamberlain's plan. They are objections of which it is impossible to deny the practical force. Mr. Chamberlain proposes to put Churchmen and Nonconformists on a level. They are both to be at liberty to find their own religious teachers, and for this purpose to use the services of the regular teachers if they choose to be so employed. But this equality will be only apparent. If the regular teachers were not allowed to give religious teaching, Nonconformists might hope to make up for their poverty by their greater zeal in finding volunteers. But if the regular teachers are allowed to teach, they will naturally offer their services to the richest and most influential denomination. I greatly fear that this would happen. No legislation can destroy the advantages that wealth naturally gives its possessors. On the other hand I believe that a great deal of money would be forthcoming when Bible teaching depended on voluntary subscriptions, and by the provision thus made the Nonconformists would largely benefit. And, further, the disappearance of Clause IV. would remove a great difficulty out of their way. There could be no more passive resistance when not a penny of the rates went to the payment of religious teaching. If concurrent disendowment proved to work unequally, at all events the last fragment of concurrent endowment would have disappeared. It would be well, however, to treat this part of the scheme as an experiment, to be tried, say, for three years and then die a natural death unless it were re-enacted.

But even if the Nonconformist objections should prove insuperable and Mr. Chamberlain's plan should come to nothing on this account, it is still of immense importance that the Church should put out a counter-proposal of some kind. So long as she abstains from doing this, her resistance to the Bill will be nothing but a waving of banners and a clashing of swords. The reality of effective opposition will be wanting. I suspect that the Government have already found this out, and I am sure that the Church will find it out in the end. The place of religion in elementary education depends upon her making the discovery in time.

D. C. LATHBURY.

THE PROSPECTS OF THE BILL

It has become clear that important and controversial Bills can no longer be carried through the House of Commons without the rough and ready method of closure by compartments. Mr. Balfour, who has had more frequent recourse to this machinery than any other Minister, admitted the fact in his evidence before the Select Committee on Parliamentary Procedure, and the only question in dispute is how the weapon should be applied. A polemical resolution, such as the House passed by an overwhelming majority in the small hours of the 19th of June, is certainly not the best way, though in the circumstances it was the one way open to the Government. On the other hand, the best parliamentary opinion is not in favour of withdrawing responsibility from Ministers of the Crown and vesting it in the Speaker, who ought to be kept out of party politics altogether. Sir Henry Fowler's committee will no doubt be able to devise, if the House of Commons is willing to accept, some practical combination of Ministerial initiative with the approval of permanent and impartial authority. Whatever is done ought to be effected before a Bill goes into committee, so that time should not be irretrievably wasted on the earlier clauses of the measure by the hare-brained chatter of irresponsible frivolity. The Leader of the Opposition, being unable to resist the principle he had so often adopted himself, fell back, naturally enough, upon criticism of details and complaint of inadequate time. But Mr. Balfour is not a good actor. When his heart is not in his work, he shows it, and the fight he made on Waterloo Day was not in the spirit of his illustrious godfather. Nobody really believes that the Education Bill will not be thoroughly discussed. What divides parties is the Bill itself.

I have said in the House of Commons, and I may be allowed to repeat here, that I do not believe in the doctrine of the imperative mandate, which is rejected in so many words, and declared not to exist, by the Constitution of the French Republic. It would, for one thing, make the House of Commons wholly superfluous. A representative of the people, says Burke, owes them not merely his time, but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving their interests if he sacrifices it to their opinion. But, of course, every elector who

voted for a Liberal candidate last January knew quite well that if a Liberal majority were returned schools receiving public money would be put under public control, and religious tests for teachers would be abolished. Ever since the Education Act of 1902 was passed by a Parliament elected in the middle of the South African war those issues have divided political parties in England and Wales. There is, I know, a third party, a party which boasts that it is governed by pure logic. It demands the removal of religion from the list of subjects taught at the public expense, and it has sixty-four members in the House of Commons. The number is almost exactly the same as that which supported Mr. Henry Richard in the same direction five-and-thirty years ago. Secularism makes slow, if any, progress in this country. I am well aware that many of those who voted for Mr. Maddison's amendment are themselves deeply religious. Mr. Masterman, for example, who made a most powerful and eloquent speech in its support, is a High Churchman. Colonel Herbert, who went into the same lobby, is a Roman Catholic. Mr. Russell is a devout Protestant. They believe that religion is best taught at home, and perhaps they are right. The practical answer to them is that, if it were not taught in school, it would not be taught at all. Many parents are indifferent, many more are busy, and teaching is a difficult art. Ever since 1870 it has been open for any School Board, or County Council, to exclude religion from elementary education. In England there are only seven schools where it is not taught. In Wales there are fifty. But the Welsh reason is that the Sunday schools of Wales, chiefly Nonconformist, are so remarkably excellent and thorough that the assistance of the day schools seems to Welsh Methodists superfluous. The people of England are on the one hand quite determined that their children shall have simple Christian teaching at the public expense, and on the other hand they are perfectly satisfied with that form of it given in Council schools. To call this religion Nonconformist is silly. With the rarest exceptions, Churchmen do not complain of it as insufficient, and free-thinkers do not repudiate it as superstitious. Free-thinkers may perhaps remember the declaration of John Mill that he knew of no higher standard than so to live as to win the approval of Christ. To train up little dogmatists in the way they should confound assertion with proof is not a happy rendering of 'Suffer little children to come unto Me.'

All Protestants are treated fairly by this Bill, and most of the lay Churchmen who oppose it do so for political reasons. Catholics, it must in fairness be acknowledged, stand on a different footing. There is no use in telling a Catholic that he holds the fundamental doctrines of Christianity in common with Protestants. You might as well tell him that he ought to believe in private judgment on matters of faith. If he did, he would not be a Catholic at all. Rather than accept unsectarian teaching from unsectarian teachers, every Catholic school

in England would be closed. The Church of England, established by Parliament and endowed by the State, cannot reasonably object to a national religion in national schools. The Book of Common Prayer itself, the most splendid monument to the English spirit of compromise, is the schedule of a statute. Roman Catholics have no Establishment, no Endowment, no privileges of any kind. They are Nonconformists, though, unlike Protestant Nonconformists, they hold that there can be no religious teaching without the sanction of the Church. They do not mind paying rates and taxes to keep up other people's religion, if they are allowed help from the same source for their own. That is the essence of Clause Four. Only the fiction of unscrupulous wire-pullers could represent this clause as framed for the sole benefit of Catholics. It applies also to Churchmen, to Wesleyans, and to Jews. If the proportion of Catholic schools affected is higher than the proportion of Church schools, that is simply because there are a great many Church schools, and very few Catholic, to which parents of other denominations must send their children. No one has hitherto suggested a fairer line of division than that. But at the same time it does seem to me that Jews and Catholics, standing as they do altogether outside the scope of Protestant Christianity, have a claim for especial treatment which Churchmen and Wesleyans have not. As Mr. Asquith said at Northampton the other day, those whose conscientious convictions are so strong that they would rather be fined or imprisoned than sacrifice them, should be most scrupulously careful not to offend the convictions of others. England is a Protestant country, and this is a Protestant Bill. It did not originate, like the Act of 1902, in Convocation, nor was it drawn to please Lord Halifax and the English Church Union. If they do not like what Laud called the Protestant Church of England, they can leave it. But real Catholics, Roman Catholics, have a claim for special consideration in respect of their poverty, in respect of their ancestral faith, and because their schools are attended almost exclusively by Catholic children. If the Government depended upon the Irish vote it would be very difficult for them to consider the claims of Catholics with impartial justice. Their enormous majority, and the impotence of the regular Opposition, enable the Cabinet to be generous without misgiving, and to be just without fear. Mr. Birrell's amendments to Clause Four are good illustrations of this power, and of the way in which it should be used.

The cry of confiscation has heralded one of the most amusing parliamentary dramas that the oldest inhabitant of St. Stephen's can remember. After the Government and the Liberal party had been denounced for months as sacrilegious robbers of denominational schools, it suddenly dawned upon the minds of the intelligent gentlemen who have constituted themselves in the House of Commons the spokesmen of a Church far better represented on the other side that

the local authority might refuse to confiscate some Voluntary school more plentifully provided with dogmas than with drains. There was a panic, almost a hubbub. A tyrannical Ministry, bent upon oppressing and insulting a Church to which most of its members belong, was about to withhold the privilege of confiscation from Church schools in defiance of right and justice. The essential absurdity of the situation is not lessened by the fact that no local body which consisted of sane men would throw away the money of the ratepayers on building new schools when there were old schools fit for the purpose. If they were not fit, even Sir William Anson, whose good sense is sometimes rather trying to his clerical constituents, acknowledged that they ought not to be taken over. Mr. Birrell met the demand of the clericalists in a way which surprised them, anticipation of events before they occur not being among the accomplishments of Tories and High Churchmen. He offered to make the transfer of schools compulsory, provided that they satisfied the requirements of the Board of Education, and that the right could be exercised by either party. That is to say, that while the local authority must take over any efficient school whose managers wished to transfer it, they would be able to acquire any school they wanted, even though it were the private property of an individual. At this point Mr. Chamberlain intervened. Mr. Chamberlain looks at religious questions from a parliamentary point of view, and he threw a fly over the Irish benches. The Government, he said, had asked for everything, and given nothing. They had made no substantial concession, and demanded what they had no right to receive. There are no stronger Denominationalists in the House of Commons than the Irish Home Rulers. But they are serious where Mr. Chamberlain is not, and Mr. Redmond at once repudiated the proffered alliance. In precise and detailed contradiction to the language of Mr. Chamberlain he argued that the Government had conceded much, and had asked for nothing important in return. It is not the rights of property, but the rights of conscience, for which Mr. Redmond and Mr. Dillon are contending. It is Clause Four, and not Clause Two, religion and not trusteeship, that they regard as vital. They may not be altogether satisfied with the Government. They have studied Mr. Chamberlain for many years; and even the Labour members, who know him far less well, are resolved that he shall not 'get at' them. The High Churchmen found themselves caught in a trap. They were indifferent to the trifling inconsistency of denouncing as confiscation the same thing which they claimed as a right. They could not afford to regard with equanimity the compulsory acquisition for public purposes of schools in private ownership. So Mr. Balfour, with effusive compliments to Mr. Birrell's personal honour and fairness, discovered or inverted the novel parliamentary doctrine that for a Minister to alter his own Bill, as he himself did when he accepted the Kenyon-Slaney Clause, is a breach

of faith! But the whole incident is full of humour. The three Commissioners, to be named in Clause Eight, have been compared with the Star Chamber and with the Venetian Council of Ten. In the debate on Mr. Birrell's proposal, which would apparently get rid of them, they figured as impartial judges, who were to be removed in favour of an administrative board, the Board of Education, under a political head. The nonsense talked in the House of Commons about trusts, especially by Mr. Evelyn Cecil, is almost incredible. Mr. Cecil has, it seems, been called to the Bar, and at all events he has read Mr. Birrell's excellent lectures on the duties of trustees. A little learning is a dangerous thing. Mr. Cecil should have drunk deeper of the Pierian spring. If he had, he would not have applied to an omnipotent Parliament dealing with public trusts the rules which govern the conduct of private trustees acting in obedience to the law. Most people know that the Act of 1902, Mr. Balfour's Act, overrode hundreds of trust deeds which regulated the appointment of managers. But most people seem to have forgotten that the Endowed Schools Act of 1869, now administered by the Charity Commissioners, entirely superseded all those educational trusts which prevented the adaptation of secondary schools to modern requirements. There is no *cy-près*, nothing about the nearest approach to the founder's views, nothing about the principles of the Court of Chancery, in the Act of 1869, passed when that great Churchman Mr. Gladstone was at the head of affairs. The Charity Commissioners, unlike the Commissioners under this Bill, are quite unrestricted, and therefore the amount of good they have done is incalculably great. As Mr. Birrell told the House of Commons in the true spirit of a Liberalism which is neither new nor obsolete, the best way of carrying out the intentions of a founder is to change his rules for dealing with facts when the facts themselves have changed.

The ludicrous pretence that the Church of England is opposed to the Bill has been abandoned in the face of ridicule, which, if not a test of truth, is at least a touchstone of absurdity. 'The Church' can be made to mean anything, even Convocation, if laymen are omitted. But laymen are like nature. You may expel them with a fork, and they will nevertheless return. There ought to be two Whit Sundays in the ecclesiastical year, if only that the bishops, or the majority of them, should pray twice to have a right judgment in all things. Interest now centres in the House of Lords, which some Radicals regard as past praying for. Mr. Chamberlain in his own garden, which he does not cultivate within the scope and meaning of *Candide*, has propounded a singular mixture of theory and prophecy. According to his ingenious, and ingenious, calculation, the Lords should throw out the Bill, so that there may be a General Election in the spring, and he may have a majority of a hundred and fifty for Tariff Reform. Tariff Reform is not exactly the issue upon which elections

held in such circumstances would turn, and the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Chamberlain's hatchet, (irily observes that the Lords know their own business best. If they rejected a Bill which has a majority of at least two hundred in the House of Commons, a House elected in the present year, the British Constitution, a very delicate machine, would cease to work. For the last ten years the House of Lords has been the servile handmaid of a Tory Government, the steady enemy of Liberal measures. If it suddenly went into furious opposition, simply because the country was predominantly Liberal, it would have to fight for its privileges against the nation, and to fight without allies. The idea that the Lords would encounter such a risk to please Mr. Chamberlain, or Lord Halifax, or the Bishop of Manchester, is, as Mr. Borthropp Trumbull, in *Middlemarch*, says of his presentation cane, positively farcical. By an arrangement of which Lord Lansdowne is understood to approve, and which implies the second reading of the Bill as an accomplished fact, the Lords will deal with the clauses in Committee after the adjournment for the summer holidays. It may be assumed that they will introduce some amendments which the House of Commons cannot accept. The pinch will be felt when the Commons' amendments to the Lords' amendments fall to be considered. No better precedent could be found for the situation which will then arise than the Irish Church Bill of 1869. It is true that the Liberal majority was much smaller then than now, that there were no Labour members, that the working classes in rural districts were not enfranchised, and that Mr. Gladstone was in all constitutional matters extremely Conservative. On the other hand, the disestablishment of the Irish Church had just been submitted to the constituencies of the United Kingdom, who had expressed themselves in favour of it, whereas the majority of the Peers were notoriously opposed to it, and only one bishop, an illustrious exception, Connop Thirlwall, of St. David's, could be found to vote for the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords at that time was Lord Cairns, by birth an Ulster Protestant, by training a consummate lawyer. Lord Cairns, and a still more eloquent Irishman, Bishop Magee, spoke and voted against the second reading. Lord Salisbury and Lord Carnarvon spoke and voted for it. The second reading was carried by a substantial majority, and then the trouble began. Those who wish to study the working of the Constitution from behind the scenes, as in books about the Constitution they never can, should read the first chapter in the second volume of Archbishop Tait's Biography by the present Archbishop of Canterbury. Tait was in the confidence of Queen Victoria, and of Mr. Gladstone. He disliked the Bill because he was an Erastian, and believed that the subordination of the Church to the State was the best safeguard of religious freedom. But he recognised, like Lord Salisbury, who was a High Churchman, that the people had spoken, and that it was futile to resist the popular

will. In the end, as everyone knows, the Lords gave way, though Lord Cairns succeeded in getting a somewhat higher amount of pecuniary compensation for the Irish clergy. The practical question now is whether Lord Lansdowne, the Duke of Devonshire, and Lord St. Aldwyn can control the majority of the Peers. The Archbishop of Canterbury, though he has used uncharacteristically strong language about the Bill, is a disciple of Tait, and would not dream of committing himself to a foolish defiance of public opinion. If the Bill were rejected, the Government would not recognise the equality of the Lords with the Commons by a dissolution. I cannot, of course, pretend to say what they would do. But there is an obvious course which, improbable as the need for it may be, appears at least worth pointing out. Ministers might advise the King to prorogue Parliament, and to summon it again without the interval of a single day. The Bill could then be reintroduced at once, passed through the Commons by a very stringent closure in a very short time, and the Lords would have a place for repentance. In 1894 there was only a week's gap between one Session and another. There need not be any gap at all. This, however, is idle speculation. The Lords are men of the world, and their temperate implacability will be nursed for a more convenient occasion. Their refusal to pass the Alien Bill, which had received unanimous assent in the other House, has not so clearly promoted their popularity as to encourage them in fresh efforts of a similar kind. There must be men among them, Conservatives in general politics, who regret the great opportunity they have irreparably lost. Their rejection of the Home Rule Bill in 1893, condoned and even endorsed at the General Election of 1895, was one of those tides in the affairs of men which taken at the flood lead on to fortune. But it was omitted. If during the most recent decade of English history the Peers had been vigilant and impartial critics of legislation, they would now occupy an impregnable rock. They have allowed themselves to be used by Tory Ministers as a party club, a second Carlton, and the result is that working men regard them with unaffected contempt. They must know, unless, as Mr. Gladstone once said, they live in a balloon, that nothing would tend more to cement and increase the popularity of the Government than a quarrel with the House of Lords.

• HERBERT PAUL.

INTERNATIONAL ART

(A DUOLOGUE.)

SCENE : *Two friends at lunch.*

JANE. Shall we go and see some pictures ?

ELIZABETH. By all means. What would you like to see ?

JANE. Well, I have been once to the new Turners and the Winter Exhibition at Burlington House, so——

ELIZABETH. Not the International ? You don't mean to say that you have not seen the great International Exhibition at the New Gallery ?

JANE. I'm afraid I haven't. You see, I went to one at Knights-bridge some years ago.

ELIZABETH. And you weren't struck ?

JANE. I was, I was. Very much struck.

ELIZABETH. My dear Jane, I remember your old-fashioned prejudices, and how you used to talk about 'beauty,' and things of that kind ; but you really cannot go on always like this ; shutting your eyes to progress, and refusing to know what the really great modern men on the Continent are doing. If you have any feeling for technique, any appreciation of power, come with me to the International, and I will show you what art means nowadays !

JANE. Thank you very much. Of course, if you'll take me——

SCENE II : *The New Gallery. Three o'clock. Enter JANE meekly, listening to ELIZABETH.*

ELIZABETH. — as I was saying, what you have to do is to clear your mind of the old-fashioned idea that a picture ought to be beautiful, for if ever a notion was exploded, that is. Beauty is not what is aimed at ; it is not the question ; it is altogether an irrelevance. A continental artist of the new school looks at the world without prejudice, and paints what we all see around us every day. Everything is fit to paint, for everything is a part of life, and the business of art is to represent life as it is ; not to select, not to idealise, and not to try to express pretty dreams. This hits your favourite Burne-Jones and

Rossetti rather hard, doesn't it? but the fact is, as any of the new men will tell you, the subject of a picture is absolutely of no importance; a pair of old boots on a shelf, if the values are rightly given, is worth all the impossible angels with impossible wings that were turned out before people knew how to put the paint on the canvas.

JANE. Is that a hit at the Old Masters? But pray go on.

ELIZABETH. Ah, I thought that would rouse you; I know your weakness for the early Italians, with their rows of saints who look as if their heads had been cut off and screwed on again the wrong way round! But if you will only let me speak for one moment, I can show you how exactly they bear out my argument.

The Old Masters, poor dears, (to put it baldly) couldn't paint. It wasn't their fault, because they lived before the art had been discovered; but that is no reason why we shouldn't recognise the fact. Well, knowing no more than children about values and atmosphere and movement, &c., they did what children do, dressed their figures in brightly coloured clothes, and wrote the names underneath. They picked out the best-looking models they could find, and arranged them in groups against white marble and blue sky, because they wanted 'beauty.' They chose scenes of romantic incident and characters in whom everyone was interested, because they wanted 'story.' And why were they determined to have these two things? Because they had nothing else. 'Beauty' and 'story,' in all ages and countries, have been the refuge of painters who couldn't paint.

JANE. I see. How eloquent you are, Elizabeth! But let us sit down quietly for a moment, while I repeat my lesson, before we begin to look at the examples by which you are going to prove it.

ELIZABETH. Yes, let us. I'm glad to see you are trying to be open-minded.

JANE. I am, really. To begin with, these modern continental artists, I understand, know their business better than anyone who has ever lived before.

ELIZABETH. Broadly speaking, yes. Of course Velasquez is an exception.

JANE. Velasquez is an exception. By-the-bye, I notice you always speak of modern *continentals*. Are there then no modern English artists?

ELIZABETH. Oh, yes, there are a few who have studied in Paris; but the modern movement took its rise on the Continent, and art in England—like most things, indeed!—is still terribly behind the times.

JANE. I see. Well, then, in the first place they paint better; secondly, they paint common things familiar to us all; thirdly, they paint them as they really are; and, lastly, they never try to paint their dreams. I think that's it, isn't it? so now I'm ready to begin.

[*They are in the South Room ; so, opening their catalogue at the beginning, they find themselves in front of 'Forains, Pitres, Têtes à Massacre,' followed immediately by Leandre's 'Deux Amis.' At this JANE gazes dutifully, while ELIZABETH expounds its 'power,' its 'relentlessness,' and so on. They continue their round, and much the same process is repeated before the other masterpieces ; though JANE, in front of the series of nude studies by Rodin, does venture on a humble doubt as to whether any real arms or legs could take certain of the positions. She bears the consequent snub well, however, and her education is continued until they drop on to a sofa at the end of the North Room.*

'Now' (*begins ELIZABETH*), 'I want you to tell me honestly——' (*JANE gets up with an air of decision*). 'You belong to a club in Dover Street' (*she says firmly*), 'and I want my tea.' (*This hint being well received, a few minutes later they are settled at a little table, engaged in removing with tea that well-known feeling which comes from looking at a great many pictures. Tea finished, ELIZABETH begins again, refreshed and eager.*) 'Well ?'

JANE. Well, it is very modern, this show ; and no doubt very clever, and powerful, and relentless, and--what is that other word art-critics are so fond of ?—oh, yes, 'unflinching.' But when I saw the Autumn Salon——

ELIZABETH. Really ? You did ?

JANE. I had that privilege—the art there struck me as more 'unflinching' still. You have not shown me many things to-day so modern as some I remember in Paris : the *Portrait of a Deformed Caddy*, the *Restaurant de Nuit*, the *Slaughter House*, and the *Operating Room*. Can the International Exhibitors have 'flinched' from these sides of life ? Or is London not thought worthy to see such pictures ?

ELIZABETH. Oh, if you won't be serious about it——

JANE. My dear Elizabeth, do you really want me to be ? Neither of us will ever convert the other ; that much is certain ; is it any good our even discussing it ?

I am old-fashioned ; you are up-to-date. I am, of course, benighted ; you are (may I say it ?) perhaps even a little *belighted*. What ? You laugh ? Oh, then, I will be serious, and give you my point of view.

And please remember, it is the point of view of an ordinary picture-lover, not an expert, capable of appreciating the brush work, the number of layers of paint, the various methods, apart from the effect they are intended to produce. I am only interested in the effect ; I don't care how you produce it ; and I would modestly point out that there are a large number of people in precisely my position.

ELIZABETH. I'm not an expert ; I know no more about these things than you do.

JANE. Really? And you alluded to them in quite an intimate way!

But if so, we start on a level, both bound to admit that whether modern technique be better or worse than the old, we have neither of us any right to talk about it, not being qualified to judge. And that disposes of the first point.

The second, you remember, was that the new men look at the world without prejudice, and paint what we all see around us every day. Have you ever seen a slaughter-house, Elizabeth?

ELIZABETH. N—no; I haven't, myself.

JANE. Or an operation? Or any of the Parisian subjects I mentioned to you? No? No more have I. So here are two average people who, so far from seeing these things around them every day, are so completely unfamiliar with them that the artist might as well be painting his dreams!

If everything is fit to paint, why do they go so far afield? If everything is a part of life (and only the 'values' matter), why do they constantly pick out parts of a particular kind?

One drawing at the International Exhibition struck me as a particularly good example of this; it was called *The Chorus on a Stone Wall*, and it depicted the whole *corps de ballet* perched side by side, waving their arms, on the top of a wall which extended across the stage. This scenic effect was naturally meant to be judged from the front; but, seen thus, it might have been pretty, and would anyhow have looked as if it were intended to be.

The artist's keen eye perceived this danger, and he has guarded against it by getting permission to go behind the scenes and choose his point of view in the wings, where the public are not admitted.

Here he has the incalculable advantage of seeing (and showing us) what no one is meant to see: the back of the girls, the back of the wall, and the long row of dirty scene-shifters with pipes in their mouths, holding below each girl the step-ladder she has climbed up by. This seems to me a typical instance. 'Beauty is not what is aimed at,' you say; true; but neither is it an 'irrelevance.' On the contrary, it is with these men a main preoccupation to avoid it. You do them an injustice if you say they look at the world without prejudice; every camera does that. No, they select; they select carefully, on a principle; and, in a sense, they idealise.

ELIZABETH. What on earth are you coming to now?

JANE. Consider a moment. What produces the unity of impression made by a show like this? The feeling of having strayed into a new world? Isn't it that behind these different styles, these different individualities, we feel the presence of one ideal, which pervades all their work? You think they paint things as they really are. Why, no one has ever lived who has done that. All that any man can do

is to paint things as they look to him, and as he likes them to look, which is his ideal.

ELIZABETH. I don't see that. Why not paint them fairly ?

JANE. As long as there's a mind behind the brush, which is the same thing as saying the painter is human, so long will there be a personal idiosyncrasy of some sort—a bias, a way of seeing things in one aspect more than another. One painter will see an ordinary modern man as Watts does ; another will see him as Leandre does in *Les Deux Amis*—hideous beyond what words can express. One will see a cow in a meadow ; another will prefer to see a cow in a slaughter-house. One will draw a horse at his best ; another, like Dupont, will look for a 'Cheval Tombé,' struggling under the shafts, flogged by his driver, with strained nostrils and agonised eyes.

Have you noticed how fond these moderns are of drawing ballet girls ?

ELIZABETH. Oh, of course, I shouldn't expect you to like them.

JANE. Why not ? I like a graceful dancing figure as much as any one ; and the old-fashioned idea of a dancing girl was that she is graceful, and that that is her *raison d'être*. But what the new school delight in showing is how awkward and ugly she can be ; in all the dozens of 'Danseuses' we saw this afternoon, I don't think there was a graceful line.

And you could see the artist had not only picked out the plainest girls to be found, but had been at some pains to choose the right moments for the effect he wanted, the ideal he had in his mind.

He gives us the *danseuse* developing her muscles by uncouth exercises, the *danseuse* painfully holding out one leg to have a tear mended ; but the pretty *danseuse*, dancing—no. From that aspect of her he has flinched ; he is true to his ideal.

Need I name it ? Hardly, I think ; the ideal of ugliness, squalor, and degradation glared at us from every wall.

ELIZABETH. This is really going too far ! What you want is nothing less than absolute unreality. That thing of Albert Moore's you were admiring this morning—why, it made me smile ! Have you ever seen—I ask you, does one ever see in everyday life, a girl standing in front of a white marble wall with nothing on but a wreath of primroses ?

JANE. I accept the challenge, if you will answer me a question too. Have you ever seen—does one ever see in everyday life—a girl standing in front of a little iron stove, with nothing on but a pair of eye-glasses ? My dear Elizabeth, of course not. They exist only as models in studios, and as visions in the painter's brain. Neither of them belongs to the 'world we see around us every day ;' in both the painter is trying to express his ideal. You can't get away from personality ; it is his world the artist shows, and must show us ; our own world we see each for ourselves. I deny that the business of art is to

copy life ; we have enough of life as it is ; we go to art for a world seen through other eyes. And the only question is whether we prefer to be shown the world of men like Mason, Calvert, Samuel Palmer, and the great Frenchmen Corot and Puvis de Chavannes (to mention a few only), or to look through the eyes of—well—they would rather appear to be the eyes of waiters, scene-shifters, and attendants at lunatic asylums.

(ELIZABETH is speechless with scorn.)

You see, I was right. Here we are both as unconverted as before you gave me this very nice tea. I hardly like (under your roof and in your club) to tell you what I once heard a clever painter say of modern continental 'realism.' He said it seemed to him a sort of 'diabolical possession.'

But I don't agree with him—I don't, indeed. I'm sure it's only a fashion. Good-bye, and many thanks.

ELIZABETH. Oh, you're quite hopeless. Where are you off to ?

JANE. Quite. I'm going to the National Gallery.

F. P. SEELEY.

THE REVIVAL OF SCULPTURE

'O! worst of all worst worsts!' (as Ben Jonson phrased it). That is the exclamation which sums up the general opinion of the Royal Academy Exhibition of 1906, so far as the pictures are concerned. The feeling that oppresses those who wander through room after room seeking for evidence of insight, of emotional impulse, of joy in the harmonious arrangement of forms and colour, is a feeling of regret for so much wasted effort. What is the good of painting pictures? I put it to the painters of Great Britain. Does it give them pleasure? Does it bring them wealth? Will they, when they look into the eyes of death, feel that they have spent their lives to any purpose?

To my mind the day of the easel picture is nearly over. It has been a long day and it is full time it should be drawing to a close. Easel pictures only began to be painted towards the end of the fifteenth century. Walter Pater thought that Giorgione (1470-1504) was 'the inventor of *genre*, of those easily movable pictures which serve neither for uses of devotion nor of allegorical or historic teaching—little groups of real men and women, amid congruous furniture or landscapes, morsels of actual life, conversation, or music, or play, refined upon or idealised until they come to seem like glimpses of life from afar.' In arriving at this judgment Pater no doubt relied upon Vasari. That most charming of all the historians of art said that Giorgione worked towards the end of his short life—which was cut off by an attack of the Plague caught from the kisses of his sweetheart—that he worked 'with no other purpose than to make figures of fancy to display his art.' And Vasari complains rather crossly, like the good old Tory he was, that no one could tell him what they meant!

Up to that time, the end of the fifteenth century, the Painter's range of subject had been limited. His art had been employed upon definite schemes of decoration. He painted altar pieces, screens, church pillars, church walls. He painted for the houses of the great and for the public buildings of cities. Up to about 1500 it never seems to have occurred to anybody to desire to break with tradition, or to produce pictures painted without any special purpose, which could be hung up on any wall, and looked at as objects of ornament.

or curiosity, apart altogether from their surroundings. It was only when the religious impulse in art had died away, and the patriotic or civic impulse was on the wane, that the painter was forced to execute such pictures. He either had to do this or to give up painting altogether.

The world has grown so accustomed to pictures being painted out of the artists' own heads in their studios and being offered for sale to anyone who cares to buy them, that it looks upon this as the natural and the only possible process. This is the world's mistake. It frequently falls into the error of supposing that what is always has been and always will be, ignoring the truth that all things are in a state of flux. The Present is no more like the Past than a son is like his father. The Future will stand to the Present in the same relation.

The vogue of the easel picture, then, has been merely an incident in the history of painting. When I use the term 'easel picture' I do not, by the way, mean it to include portraits. They stand in a class by themselves. The phrase covers landscapes, figure studies, subject pictures of every kind, all paintings, in short, which are executed by the artist according to his own unhampered fancy, to be disposed of to the highest bidder and exposed to view wherever the purchaser may please.

Of such paintings there are produced in this country alone not less than ten thousand, at a low estimate, every year. In a prosperous year, perhaps, a hundred or two may find purchasers. The painters who are fortunate enough to sell their work are regarded not merely as successful men, but as successful painters. They are held to have succeeded in their art, as well as in the scramble for a living wage. But let us trace to its destination a picture by one of these fortunate men, and let us see whether they can really be said to have succeeded at all in the artistic sense.

Our picture will be bought by a man of great possessions. Only such buy pictures. Those whose means are not greatly in excess of their needs content themselves, if they hang their walls with pictures at all, with reproductions of the world's great paintings. For them the best is good enough. They do not ask for novelty as well.

Seeing that riches and taste are usually in an inverse ratio one to the other, the chances are that our purchaser has no taste. He buys the picture either because his wife has met the artist at dinner, or because he is advised to do so. The reason for the advice may be : (1) that the artist's work is in fashion ; or (2) that it is expected to go up in value ; or (3, more likely still) that the adviser is a friend of the artist's, anxious to do him a good turn.

Having got it home, the man of great possessions looks at it more carefully and decides where it shall be hung. Perhaps he hangs it in his dining-room or drawing-room, where it has to fight for its life

with a number of other pictures all jumbled incongruously together, and where, amid a confused riot of pretentious decoration and frankly hideous utility, it has no more chance of producing the impression at which the artist aimed than if it were exhibited in one of Messrs. Maple's shop windows or an old curiosity shop.

Perhaps he decides that he does not care for it so much as he supposed. Men often feel this way about their possessions when they have got them home; whether the article in question be a picture or a wife. In this case the picture is hung in the second-best bedroom or in the passage leading to the garden door. There it stays until the purchaser dies or vacates the house. Then arises the question: What shall be done with it now? Seeing that it once cost money there is a natural repugnance against putting it on the fire. So it goes into a lumber room and gradually rots itself out of existence, and presently it finds its way on to the rubbish heap in company with the pictures which were once its companions at Burlington House and which were not sold.

Can this be called success? What is the difference between the painter who sells his pictures and the painter who fails to do so? The former makes a living. The latter does not. That is all. The works of both meet eventually with a similar fate. The house-painter is as good a man as either, aye, and better. He knows he is working for the moment only and he puts on no 'side.' It is impossible any longer to maintain the pretence that the mass of painters are anything more than handicraftsmen, producing articles for which they (mistakenly) imagine there is a demand, with no other object than to earn a livelihood. How many are there who have anything to say to us, any ideas to impart? How many who have felt beauty tugging at their heart-strings and have longed to share their Vision Glorious with the rest of mankind?

The aim of Art is to arouse noble emotion. It appeals to the emotional side of man's nature. If a poem or a picture or a piece of sculpture does not make you feel something—possibly it may be what the painter or the poet or the sculptor felt: possibly not, he may have written or painted or modelled better than he knew—if, I say, it arouses no emotion at all, it is not a work of art. There is no infallible test other than this.

The argument that all great works of art do not arouse emotion in all people, and that, therefore, this touchstone is as fallible as the rest, need scarcely be considered. All people are not able to follow the reasoning of Euclid. We do not blame Euclid for that.

Tried by this test, the painters of to-day are condemned almost in bulk. How many are there whose work is inspired by noble emotion? Of skill in handling brushes, and in laying on of paint, there is no lack. Of any feeling behind the painter's hand and brain there is little trace in any of our exhibitions. Our painters might

achieve nobly if they were commissioned to execute traditional subjects. Left to themselves they fall victims either to the Scylla of the Trivial or the Charybdis of the Vague. They have technical ability, but no ideas.

That is the reason why their work is so arid and dull. That is why we have witnessed so rapid a decline of the fashion (ridiculous at any time, even in an age of painting geniuses) of hanging pictures at haphazard all over the walls of a house without any scheme of arrangement, letting them struggle with one another for the beholder's attention. The taste which is most in vogue now goes to the other extreme. Taught by Morris and his disciples, we try to make our rooms pictures in themselves. We do not seek to palliate a hideous wall-paper by plastering paintings on it. We choose a wall-paper which shall itself give pleasure to the eye. Probably this change would have come about in any case, but it has been hastened by the decline of the painter's art. Ninety-nine out of every hundred paintings to-day are like laboriously decorated jam-pots with no jam in them. They are like books printed with care whose letters form no words, convey no meaning to the mind.

There is, nevertheless, a bright side to the immediate future of the arts which are represented at Burlington House. There is even a bright side to the present Academy exhibition. It is clear that we are going to have a revival of sculpture. This development has been in the air for some years past. The very presence in the world of such a great sculptor as Rodin has something to do with it. He has given the art a new impetus. He has shown afresh what the sculptor can do. He has made us more impatient of all that is heavy, formal, dull. He has proved that the clay, when it is handled by a man of genius and temperament, and warm emotions and vivid imagination, can be made to stir our feelings deeply. Rodin, in short, possesses just what the painters of our time lack—ideas. He models his clay with brains, and he has set on a number of his fellow sculptors to strive after putting individuality into their work instead of letting it be swamped by convention and routine.

Of the low condition to which sculpture fell in England during the eighteenth century, and in which it remained until a few years ago, we need no further evidence than the evidence of our eyes. As we walk about London, our vision is constantly assailed by monstrosities in stone or marble or bronze, which would be incredible did they not exist. There are, it seems to me, only three pieces of sculpture in the whole of London which can be looked at with any pleasurable emotion, which convey any emotion at all, except a sense of immeasurable depression and disgust. These are:

(1) The King Charles the First statue at the top of Whitehall, a work of rare beauty and distinction. Let us be grateful to the old fellow who, when the Commonwealth Parliament ordered it to be

destroyed, buried it safely in his garden and sent the Vandals a cart-load of scrap iron!

(2) The Carlyle statue in the Chelsea Embankment garden, by Sir Edgar Boehm, a noble memorial of the rugged thinker who lived close by, catching the very character of him as surely as the Whistler portrait did.

(3) The memorial to Sir Arthur Sullivan in the Victoria Embankment garden close to the Savoy Theatre, by Mr. Goscombe John. Difficult as it was to deal with Sullivan's undistinguished features, his scrubby moustache and disfiguring side whiskers, Mr. John seems to me to have treated his subject with the happiest ingenuity. The eye is taken by the graceful form of the woman who leans her head on her arm against the pedestal in an attitude of utter abandonment to grief. The small bust of the musician is hardly noticeable except as an integral portion of the design.

It is typical of the British attitude towards the seemly and the beautiful, that a complaint was lodged against the artist, at the time of the unveiling of this work of unusual merit and charm, for not having made Sullivan more prominent. The complainants would, no doubt, have liked a trousered, frock-coated, standing figure like that grotesque one of Brunel which affronts the eye near at hand; or possibly a seated effigy after the fashion of the statue, also not far off, of John Stuart Mill, who seems to be rising hastily after taking his seat, exclaiming with some (pardonable) annoyance that he had encountered the business end of a nail. Some day we shall break up all these ugly, stiff, ungainly figures which bear witness to the evil fortunes upon which the art of sculpture once fell in our country. We have begun to see what message sculpture should bring to us—a message of pleasure, of emotion, of joy. We have begun to understand that it ought to show us, not how hideous the human form can be made by modern clothing, but how beautiful are its lines, how exquisite its proportions, when it is unspoilt. We are looking now to the sculptor to quicken our powers of imagination. People who have in their houses, as so many do now, casts of the wonderful works of classical times, or even those pleasant little bronzes of modern workmanship which abound in Munich, Vienna, and Paris, will not put up for ever with the Albert Memorial.

To estimate the distance which separates us from the mid-Victorian period, compare the noble, tender, and dignified 'Memorial to the Men who fell in the Boer War,' by Mr. Nicholson Babb, in the central hall at Burlington House, with the grotesque Guards' memorial erected after the Crimean War at the bottom of Waterloo Place. The latter tells us nothing. It gives us no feeling, except a feeling that we should like to leave the spot as rapidly as possible. Mr. Babb's group, on the other hand, is obviously the work of a man who has felt his subject, and is skilful enough technically to make

us feel it too. The angel is really impressive; its wings are treated with exceptional ingenuity and sense of style. The wounded soldier could scarcely be improved upon in any respect. His attitude of utter weariness and exhaustion is moving, and intensely human. Yet one can trace, too, the sculptor's assurance that he is dying in a good cause, and is glad to die. The people of Grahamstown, South Africa, are to be envied this fine adornment to their town. We have in London no memorial of its nature which could for a moment compete with it.

Close by Mr. Babb's group is a belated specimen of the kind of sculpture which passed muster with the mid-Victorians. I have always heard that Lucknow is an unpleasant place, in the hot weather especially, but surely it has done nothing bad enough to merit the erection in one of its public places of this comical effigy of Sir John Woodburn, late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. It would be funny anywhere. Contrasted with Mr. A. C. White's 'Naiade,' showing clearly the influence of Rodin; with Mr. Portsmouth's finely imagined 'Captive,' an image of rayless despair; with Mr. Garbe's powerful and arresting 'Selbstsüchtiger,' which should be presented to Mr. Roosevelt if he conquers the Trusts; with Mr. David McGill's 'Renunciation,' breathing the very spirit of its title; or even with Mr. Pegram's graceful seated figure of Sir Thomas Browne, its stupidity becomes a huge joke. It is difficult, indeed, when we notice that it is by the man who designed and executed the Sullivan monument (of which I have already spoken) not to believe that it is an intentional joke. This, however, would be doing Mr. John an injustice. He has merely done what he knew was expected of him. It is because sculptors are ceasing to follow this line that sculpture is looking up. Any appeal to emotion in place of meaningless adherence to tradition is bound to be attacked, as Rodin's 'Balzac' was. Rodin took no notice. Against whom is the laugh now? Against the bumble-headed pedants who attacked him. Mr. John should flout convention and be himself. The sort of statue he has made of Sir John Woodburn should be left to marble masons to execute and to sorrowing relatives to erect in cemeteries. It is as little in place in an art exhibition as a wreath of immortelles under a glass cover would be at a flower show.

Of the quieter pieces in the central hall, there is nothing more satisfactory than Mr. Albert Toft's small group of his children. It is an excellent idea to have children modelled instead of painted. The result in most cases would be more decorative; and of children especially, the charm and the character can be expressed far more effectively in clay than on canvas. Such a work as this of Mr. Toft's would lend distinction to any room. One of the difficulties connected with sculpture is that people will not buy it, because they do not know what to do with it. The atmosphere of our climate makes it impossible to keep statuary in the gardens, and except in a very large

house there is no room for the large groups which most sculptors go in for. Mr. Toft's entirely successful experiment clears that difficulty out of the way. Another small piece which would look very well, say, upon the staircase of a medium-sized house, is Mr. Anders Olson's 'Gamine,' a sweet little figure with a hoop, instinct with the demure prettiness of childhood. Miss May Pownall's 'The Flood' would fill a similar place so far as its size goes, but most people would think it too vivid and expressive in its delineation of panic to be lived with always. It should be in a more public place.

The pieces mentioned would alone make this year's sculpture exhibition the most hopeful and interesting the Academy has had within living memory. But in the lecture-room there are further signs of the revival of the art. They are more scattered here; pleasant oases amid deserts of ugliness; but they cannot fail to catch and delight the seeing eye. Take even the three official memorials of eminent divines—Temple, Creighton, and Hole. They are not specially distinguished, but they would not disgrace any cathedral, however full it might be of beautiful things. Alongside the rows of horrid Tussaud-like effigies which deface the splendour of Westminster Abbey, and mar the restful dignity of St. Paul's, they would appear works of soaring genius. They mark an enormous improvement in the taste of our sculptors, which is bound in time to improve the taste of our public, this being the only way the public taste ever is or ever can be improved. The mass of people will never set up a sudden demand for beauty. It must be forced upon them, as Morris forced his designs, and Turner his painting, and Wagner his music, and Rodin his creations in clay.

It would be tedious to mention all the works of merit which will make the sculpture rooms of 1906 notable in the history of the art of our time. Much more desirable is it to urge all who read this to go and verify for themselves the assertion I make as to the new spirit which is finding its way into the works of so many of the sculptors of to-day. We have had evidence of it at the New Gallery and at the international shows. But this is the first year the new spirit has affected the official exhibition. That, in England, marks a notable advance.

II. HAMILTON FYFE.

IMPROVED SHOP ARCHITECTURE FOR LONDON

THE NEW REGENT'S QUADRANT

For close upon a century the Regent's Quadrant has been one of the most familiar sights to Londoners and their visitors, and great were the misgivings that arose when it became known that the original leases were running out, and that the Quadrant would have to be rebuilt; that, further, an hotel syndicate had acquired a large site previously occupied by the St. James's Hall and Restaurant on which they intended to build a gigantic hotel.

The demolition of the restaurant and concert hall (looking very picturesque in their destruction) first made the general public aware of what was about to happen; and, though the man in the street as a rule takes but little interest in its architecture, he could not look on wholly unmoved while these well-known landmarks were being swept away.

All know and most people appreciate Nash's great design in forming the road from St. James's Park to Regent's Park--first comes the open place with the Duke of York's column and steps, then Waterloo Place handsomely terminated by the dignified insurance building, and then the Quadrant turning the corner in a quiet, unpretentious, but dignified way, and originally embellished with a colonnade which was equivalent to a covered arcade. Then the long line of Regent Street intersected by Oxford Circus and terminated by the spire of All Souls, Langham Place: and then, after another dexterous turn, finishing worthily with Portland Place and Park Crescent, the whole forming a noble thoroughfare of which we have every reason to be proud.

This extensive scheme, which in its making transformed the district of London through which it passed, was carried out on Crown land with great foresight and public spirit by the managers of the Crown property, thus setting an example to our local authorities which, had it been followed by them in a similar spirit, would have made

London to-day a very different place from what it is. A street such as this is a great possession to any city, and it is right that any alterations of it should be jealously watched by its citizens, especially if any tendency is shown by any section of the community to advocate rebuilding which would lower its character as one of the great architectural features in London. We may regret the loosening of control that seems taking place in other parts of Regent Street, but in the Quadrant it is very satisfactory to know that architectural considerations have had due weight with the Crown as ground landlord and secured a fitting treatment of it.

That the Quadrant must be rebuilt now that the leases are running out is undoubted, much as for some reasons we may regret it. Modern requirements and habits are different to what they were when the Quadrant was built, so that the upper portions of the buildings over the shops are now comparatively useless. This being so, the immediate rebuilding on the St. James's Hall site, already referred to, necessitated the preparation of a complete design for the whole of the Quadrant. The Crown, as every one now knows, has been fortunate enough to obtain the services of a worthy successor to Nash to carry out this great work in Mr. R. Norman Shaw, R.A., whose design for the new Quadrant is exhibited in the Royal Academy, while the shops themselves on the St. James's Hall portion of the site are already actually built and may be seen above the hoarding in the Quadrant.

To describe the design is unnecessary, as it has already been widely published, and is by this time well known; suffice it to say it will be found worthy of its author; that the general façade will again be crowned by a continuous cornice, not even interrupted by the former break in Air Street; while the satisfying repetition of parts will be retained, and painted stucco will give place to that most noble of all building materials for London, Portland stone.

All this is as it should be, for the site is admittedly one of the finest in London, and demands as a first consideration the best architectural treatment obtainable, while at the same time providing suitable shops on the ground floor and an elevation of good architectural character which shall not be too costly and burdensome for the tenants who have to rebuild. With regard to this latter point, the architect to the Hotel syndicate, who is now carrying out that portion of Mr. Shaw's elevation, has recently stated that the design is found to be in its lines and details one of the most simple it is possible to have.

As to the provision of suitable shops; we have long been called a nation of shopkeepers: let us hope that what is being now done in the Quadrant will set a fashion which may presently warrant the phrase of 'artistic shopkeepers' being applied to us.

Regent Street is above all things a shopping street; and of course for the public convenience it should and will be so; but as it is also our finest street, it should provide especially for our finest shops in the finest way—and this cannot be done unless proper scope is given to architectural requirements.

Of recent years, 'unmitigated' shop fronts have been allowed to run riot through our streets, facilitated perhaps by the relaxed conditions in the latest building act. It seems to be considered essential by some to face the whole of the ground and first floor fronts of a long series of houses with an appalling mixture of plate glass, looking glass, and tawdry wood and brass work; to commence any architectural treatment on the second floor, and to cover the whole building over in due course with advertising announcements. Now even if, as some contend, this vulgar treatment results in increased sales for a time, there can be little doubt but that it leads in the long run to the deterioration of the character of the street and of the shops as first-class business property. It has been hinted, in the supposed interest of the shopkeepers, that provision should have been made for such shop fronts in the Quadrant itself, where surely if anywhere such a treatment should be an absolutely derogatory impossibility.

Walking through our streets it is fairly obvious to the most superficial observer that it is not necessarily the best firms who have the largest window shows, but rather the contrary.

Public taste, by common consent, has improved in recent years, and is hardly likely to be long impressed with these vulgar shop-fronts which entirely disregard all surrounding æsthetic and structural conditions, and vulgarise not only the buildings to which they are attached, but also the goods which are displayed in them.

Art dealers seem for some time to have become aware that the more precious the articles the fewer of them need be shown at one time, and in many businesses the size of the show space seems to diminish in direct ratio with the standing of the firm. Quality is treated as more important than quantity.

It will be admitted that a street cannot be dignified unless the buildings on both sides of it are dignified, and no building can be dignified unless carried on supports which are not only structurally sufficient for their purpose, but also appear to the eye to be so.

In the new shops in the Quadrant piers are only placed at the party-walls which divide one house from the other, while the whole of the interspace is left entirely to the will of the tenant to fill in as he pleases for the purposes of his business.

In such a street as the Regent's Quadrant this treatment seems to give all that can possibly be required, and it is greatly to be hoped that, as public taste continues to improve, the example thus set by the Crown may be followed by other landlords in many of the more

important streets. The beauty of our cities is a potent factor in attracting and detaining those who are likely to be our customers; and when this fact has once been realised, the time will not be far off when the tenants of a fine thoroughfare will resent as an outrage the appearance of vulgar blatant fronts in its midst as lowering it to the level of a second or third class neighbourhood.

ASTON WEBB.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER



No. CCCLIV—AUGUST 1906

THE REPORT ON ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE

I

IN April 1904 the Government of Mr. Balfour appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the illegalities stated to be practised in the Church of England, and in June 1906 this Commission has issued its Report. Considering the gravity of the issues at stake, the large mass of material to be received and verified, the immense field of Church history which had to be reviewed, as well as the previous efforts to deal with breaches of the law which had to be considered, it cannot be urged that the Commission has greatly transgressed the limits of time necessary for so vast a task. The Report which is now in our hands is an evidence of the care and patience and assiduity with which the Commissioners have pursued their labours. It would not be possible to speak too highly of the calm, dispassionate and judicial temper of the whole document, nor to praise unduly the fairness and impartiality with which the evidence of all the witnesses has been received and considered. The Commissioners have had a task of great difficulty to perform. Grave allegations had been brought forward

by the Protestant party in the Church of England of a widespread breach of the law, all pointing to a determination on the part of a Romanising section of the Church to undo the work of the Reformation. The Commissioners were desired by the late Government to ascertain how far these accusations were correct; how large was the number of transgressors, and, granting that the evil was of the nature described, what remedies could be brought to bear on the case.

This task they have performed in such a manner as to have earned the thanks of all Churchpeople; and whatever the result may be, their work will remain a monument of untiring zeal and devotion and a document of the greatest value to the country.

To criticise adequately such a work would demand an amount of knowledge of ecclesiastical law, Church history and theological questions that few possess, and I would not venture on so bold a step; but to anyone interested in Church matters a few points in the Report present themselves as salient features, upon which it is not so difficult to form an opinion. Moreover, as a member of the Joint Evidence Committee, I may at any rate lay claim to some knowledge of the facts of the case as they appeared to those whose object it was to convince the Commission and the public of the truth of the statements they had long been making.

As to the accuracy of these statements, the Report, as far as it goes, amply substantiates the case of the Protestant party.

Chapter IV. in the Report is devoted to 'Present breaches and neglect of the law,' and these are divided into two classes, 'Non-significant' and 'Significant,' or, in other words, breaches of the law occasioned through convenience, negligence, or custom, entitled 'non-significant,' and breaches of the law significant of doctrines removed in varying degrees from those contained in the Prayer-book of the Church of England, and held also in varying degrees by those who are guilty of them. These are rightly termed 'significant.' The first class of breaches are almost entirely those alleged against the Protestant or Evangelical party. Four pages of the Report suffice to cover them; whilst the latter class, which consists entirely of the practices of the Anglican school, are so numerous, and require such minute description, that no less than thirty pages are devoted to them. These practices range from such as might be held to cover doctrines not prohibited by our articles and formularies to those which have their exact counterpart in the Church of Rome. The lesser irregularities, though in themselves illegal, are, nevertheless, looked upon less gravely, as being in some sort of sense not absolutely at variance with the teaching of the Church of England; but the Report well observes, with regard to these irregularities in the direction of excess, that it must be recognised that an accumulation of such practices in a service may under certain conditions have an effect more serious, and further removed from the standard of the Prayer-

book and the type of worship inculcated by the Church of England, than the several practices taken singly would appear to have.

In a large number of the services of Holy Communion [they state] as to which evidence has been given, vestments, the Confiteor, illegal lights, incense, the Lavabo, the ceremonial mixing of the chalice, the wafer, a posture rendering the manual acts invisible, the sacring bell, and the last Gospel, are all or nearly all in use, and unite to change the outward character of the service from that of the traditional service of the Reformed English Church to that of the traditional service of the Church of Rome.

The Commissioners, however, are evidently deeply impressed with the existence of other and graver practices significant of doctrines entirely condemned by the Church of England. They admit that they have been shown to exist in considerable numbers. They state, they 'lie on the Romeward side of a line of deep cleavage between the Church of England and that of Rome,' and 'that the only question that can arise as to them is not whether they can be sanctioned, but how they can most effectively be dealt with so as to be made to cease.'

No doubt, if action were taken vigorously and without delay against all those who are at the present moment guilty of them, much good might be done. It must not, however, be forgotten that the lesser irregularities in the significant class are those which lead up to the graver ones, and many of them contain the same doctrines in their initial stages. Putting together the significant practices, subdivided by the Report into three classes, we have the formidable list of no less than thirty-four different illegalities widely practised in the Church of England. A list of the three classes is subjoined:—

Illegal practices:

- (1) Vestments.
- (2) Confiteor and last Gospel.
- (3) Ceremonial mixing of the chalice.
- (4) Wafers.
- (5) Lavabo.
- (6) The hiding of the manual acts.
- (7) The sign of the Cross.
- (8) Sanctus bell.
- (9) Incense.
- (10) Portable lights.
- (11) Lights upon the holy table.
- (12) Holy water.
- (13) Blessing of palms.
- (14) Tenebræ.
- (15) Washing the altars.
- (16) Paschal candle.
- (17) Stations of the Cross.

(18) Observance of days not appointed by the Prayer-book to be observed :

- (i) Harvest thanksgivings, &c.
- (ii) Black letter saints' days.
- (iii) Days excluded from the Prayer-book Kalendar.

Illegal practices of a graver kind connected with the service of Holy Communion :

- (19) Celebrations without communicants, and (20) children's Eucharists.
- (21) Use of the canon of the Mass.
- (22) Omission of the Invitation.
- (23) Omission of the Creed and the Gloria in Excelsis.
- (24) Elevation.
- (25) Genuflexion.
- (26) Ecce Agnus Dei, &c.
- (27) Reservation.
- (28) Mass of the prae-sanctified.
- (29) Benediction.

Illegal practices as grave as the foregoing, mostly concerning (i) the relation of the Church in her services towards (a) the Blessed Virgin Mary, (b) the Saints, and (ii) the veneration of images :

(30) Observance of days either excluded from the Kalendar in the Prayer-book or introduced since the Reformation into the Kalendar of the Roman Church.

(31) Hymns to the Blessed Virgin Mary and (32) Intercessions of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of Saints.

(33) Veneration of images.

(34) Veneration of rods.

We may, therefore, claim to have abundantly proved our case against the extreme Anglican party. It may be argued, as no doubt it will be, that to prove Romish practices in 559 churches is no evidence of any widespread growth of Romanism in the Church of England ; but we maintain that that figure in no sense represents the extent of the evil. To procure evidence is a costly, difficult, and ungrateful task. Churches had to be visited, entailing long and repeated journeys ; trustworthy witnesses, willing to undertake the task, were hard to find, especially such as were competent to describe the minutiae of Roman ritual ; the time was short, and only a limited amount of reliable information could be obtained. Besides which, both our Committee and that of the Church Association were informed by the Secretary of the Royal Commission, after a certain date, that no more evidence was required. It would be a great mistake to measure the extent of the Romeward movement in the Church by the comparatively small number of churches described in the Report, and although

we would not for a moment dispute the fact that a large proportion of the clergy of the Church are loyal to its prescribed ritual, enough has been shown of an opposite character to call for vindication of the law.

That part of the Report, therefore, which deals with the recommendations is that to which everyone will turn, and it is there that a feeling of disappointment is experienced. The recommendations are ten in number; but the chief importance centres in two. These are a revision of the rubrics and a reform of the ecclesiastical courts.

A revision of the rubrics has an attractive sound, and has from some points of view much to be said for it. There is no doubt of a need of greater elasticity in Church life in certain directions, and it is indisputable that Church work is cramped and hindered by rubrics and laws drawn up under totally different conditions. It is, for instance, a manifest waste of energy, becoming almost an absurdity, to insist upon a daily repetition of Morning and Evening Prayer, when in the rush and strain and stress of modern work and life such a requirement leads constantly to a curate reading the Service to an empty church, whilst a vast population outside is toiling at the daily round of work which entirely prohibits their attendance. Time is thus consumed which could be better spent by the clergy in study, or visiting the sick, or in other parochial duties. A rubric, also, which requires that anyone intending to partake of Holy Communion should signify his name to the curate the day before is manifestly not only impossible, but altogether undesirable. It is, also, evidently to be regretted that when a great wave of religious fervour is sweeping over the country, as recently in Wales, or when some great event of national history has stirred the country to its depths, our Church should be precluded by hide-bound rules from either participating in the one or giving expression to the other.

In these and many other directions relief is needed. The non-significant breaches of the law which the Report records are evidences of how some of the provisions of our rubrics press hardly on Church life and work, and if a revision could be undertaken with regard to some of these matters, it would obviate much inconvenience, and be a very practical improvement.

But a revision of the rubrics opens the door to much more than this, and is evidently contemplated for other objects.

Before, therefore, consenting to so grave a step in a crisis like the present, when a large party in the Church is heading towards Rome, we must know what direction a revision of the rubrics would take.

The Commissioners are impressed, they tell us, with the fact 'that the public worship of the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation; that it needlessly condemns much which Churchpeople value; that modern thought and feeling are characterised by a care for ceremonial and a sense of dignity in worship.' They come, therefore, to the conclusion that the rubrics

must be revised in the direction of greater elasticity, or, in other words, of allowing some things that are at present illegal.

But let us examine this a little more in detail. Let us take a cathedral service as an example of what our rubrics allow, and ask ourselves whether it lacks any of those characteristics which the Commissioners rightly discern to be necessary to many, and which certainly are appreciated by all. What is there to prevent this being the model to which every church in the country may aspire? Is an alteration of the rubrics necessary here to satisfy modern ideas?

If we are to go beyond this in order to meet the religious needs of the present day, it is evident we must contemplate sanctioning some of those other practices enumerated in the Report under the heading of 'Breaches of the law having significance,' but not necessarily descriptive of doctrines prohibited by the Church of England. These are the first eighteen in the list given above.

To take the very first on the list, viz. vestments. This practice raises the most vital doctrine of the sacrificial character of the Holy Communion, for which the Ritualists contend, but which we maintain finds no sanction or authority from the Prayer-book. The permission to use a distinctive garment at the Holy Communion would be a virtual permission to hold the doctrine. The Ritualists certainly would consider it as such, for they have constantly asserted that the vestments are claimed as significant of that doctrine. How, then, can Evangelicals concede this point? A surrender here would mean a surrender of the central position of our Church with regard to the difference between the Mass and the Holy Communion. It is, therefore, impossible to look upon vestments as a harmless adjunct. Those who desire their reintroduction do so with a clear object in view, which in justice to them we must own they have never scrupled to declare.

A victory achieved by them on this point would, therefore, be a victory all along the line. It would be the height of folly on our part to give way. Our present position with regard to vestments is an impregnable one. They have no claim whatever from antiquity. They were never worn in the primitive Church as in any sense connected with the Holy Communion. All historical research goes to prove that their special use in point of time synchronises with the growth of those material views of the Sacrament which culminated in the doctrine of Transubstantiation. For this reason, when we rejected the doctrine we discarded the distinctive dress that typified it. To allow the dress now, after a disuse of 300 years, would be a virtual denial of the stand made by the Reformers and an admission that our Church had been in error during all that period. To this the Evangelical party will never consent, and it cannot be too clearly stated that any attempt to admit a permissive use of vestments would lead to a disruption of the Church.

The memorial presented to the Commission by the Dean of Canterbury, and mentioned in the Report, which was signed in a few days by nearly 10,000 persons, is a proof of the accuracy of this statement.

To labour all the other items on the list is hardly necessary. They are, if not significant of doctrines verging Romewards, at any rate all an imitation of Roman forms of worship which are alien to the spirit of the Reformed Church of England. To legalise any of them would be to take a very long step in the direction of Rome, especially when they are advocated by men who openly work for reunion with that Church. It is the greatest possible mistake to imagine that concessions to that party will improve the situation in the Church of England. Lord Halifax has laid down as his terms of peace that there must be a recognition, as part of the heritage of the Church of England, of vestments, the use of incense, lights, the mixed chalice, reservation of the Sacrament for the sick, as well as the practice of offering the Holy Sacrament, and of prayers for the dead in Christ. Are these terms which a Church calling itself reformed and Protestant can accept? If we could once imagine such terms granted, and rubrics framed which would allow of all these practices, what would the immediate result be? An enormous impetus would be given to the whole Romeward movement. The Ritualist party, having compelled the English Parliament to alter the rubrics of the Church of England and legalise previous illegalities, would go forward with renewed vigour towards the accomplishment of their programme. It is hardly possible to conceive anything more disastrous from the point of view of securing peace for the Church.

The second remedy proposed by the Commissioners is the reform of the ecclesiastical courts. The report assigns, as one of the chief causes of the failure to maintain law and order in the Church, the constitution of the Court of Final Appeal for ecclesiastical causes, and makes the startling statement that since thousands of clergy with strong lay support refuse to recognise its jurisdiction, its judgments cannot be practically enforced.

Without entering into the question of the policy of meeting a prolonged and sustained course of law-breaking by revising the law to suit the law-breakers, a policy which has never been attended with success in past history, it is, perhaps, more profitable to inquire into the constitution of this court, and see on what ground it rests and whether its authority is impeachable. To do so we must go back to the time of Henry the Eighth and study the history of his reign. Such a study will prove to us that this court, representing, as it does, the Royal supremacy, is the rock on which our Reformation settlement is built, and upon which the liberties of Englishmen depend.

Although actuated by political rather than religious motives, Henry was the real author of the legislation which has secured our freedom by delivering us from the jurisdiction of the courts of spiritual

discipline. Up to his time the lives and liberties of the people were at the mercy of these tribunals. When Henry came to the throne, the hatred of the clergy, and the strong anti-clerical feeling which pervaded the country, were due, we are told by Bishop Stubbs, 'to the ever-spreading and rankling sore produced by the inquisitorial, mercenary, and generally disreputable character of these courts.'¹ It was from direct distrust and dissatisfaction with 'spiritual judges' that Parliament insisted on an appeal being given to the Crown from each and all of the archbishops' courts. It is recorded of the King as far back as 1515 that, when he rescued Dr. Standish from the clutches of the Cardinal Archbishop of York and the Primate, he used these words: 'By the will of God I am king of England, and by ancient custom have no superior save God. I intend to maintain the rights of my crown as fully as any of my progenitors have done. You yourselves of the spirituality act expressly against divers of the decrees, and interpret them according to your fancy. I will never consent to your desires.'² All the acts of King Henry's reign were designed to curb the power of the clergy and to establish on a firm footing the absolute supremacy of the Crown, and this in the interests of the liberty of the laity. In this course of action he was supported by the Commons of England. One essential feature of the Reformation was that it was a lay movement.

'The importance of the new measures,' says Mr. Green in his *History of England*, 'lay really in the action of Parliament. They were an explicit announcement that Church reform was now to be undertaken, not by the clergy, but by the people at large.'³ The people were determined to strike for their freedom, and found in Henry their agent for carrying out the policy to which they equally with him were pledged.

It is this supremacy which is threatened by any tampering with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Ritualist party have always realised that as long as this court existed they were powerless to establish that system of ecclesiastical discipline and control over the laity upon which their minds are set, and which has been insisted on by some of their most eminent leaders as the proper business of an ecclesiastical court. Not only this, but they found themselves also hindered by the decisions of the court in developing that ritual and ceremonial which they value as constituting the link they desire with the Catholic Church of pre-Reformation times. They have, therefore, constantly asserted on all occasions the impropriety of lay judges adjudicating on spiritual questions. They have insisted that the government of the Church is vested by Divine right in the hands of the bishops, and that the decision of all

¹ *Constitutional History*, vol. iii. p. 523.

² See Heywood's *Preface to Bishop Gardiner's Oration* (Longmans), p. 20.

³ *History of England*, vol. ii. p. 148.

matters of faith and doctrine appertains to them, and not to the laity. An absolute refusal on their part to obey the judgments of the Privy Council or to pay the slightest heed to its findings, added to a cumbrous and expensive form of procedure, has led to a practical abandonment on the part of the authorities of any effort to uphold the law. Consequently, those who are aggrieved by the action of law-breaking clergy find themselves practically without redress. It is not sufficiently considered how much the laity suffer through the high-handed action of the clergy who force an elaborate ritual on an unwilling congregation. It is true such clergy may succeed at last in securing support in a greater or less degree, but only through the process of driving away all those to whom the Church rightfully belongs, and ministering to a flock either educated by themselves or drawn from other parishes. A condition has thus arisen which is a scandal to the Church. The Commissioners, in their anxiety to relieve this situation, favour a plan which would place the final appeal in matters of faith and doctrine not, as it is now, in the Crown, as expressed by a lay court in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but in the hands of the archbishops and bishops, without any appeal from their decisions. They propose in their fifth recommendation that :

Where, in an appeal before the Final Court which involves charges of heresy or breach of ritual, any question touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England shall be in controversy, which question is not, in the opinion of the Court, governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament, and involves the doctrine or use of the Church of England proper to be applied to the facts found by the Court, such question shall be referred to an assembly of the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, who shall be entitled to call in such advice as they may think fit ; and the opinion of the majority of such assembly of the archbishops and bishops with regard to any question so submitted to them shall be binding on the Court for the purposes of the said appeal.

Such a proposal, if carried, would allow, we may conclude, of a decision by an ecclesiastical court on any question relating to the articles of the Church of England,⁴ or to the intention of the new rubrics as revised by the Convocation.⁵ The Commissioners, in order to justify this recommendation, quote with much approval the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, the object of which was, it states, 'to reconstruct the Final Court without violation of constitutional principles.'

That Commission was nominated by Mr. Gladstone, and issued its Report in 1883. It was composed of men such as Professors Freeman and Stubbs, convinced mediævalists; members of the English Church Union like the Marquis of Bath and the Earl of Devon, and many other noted High Churchmen; whilst only two Evangelicals,

⁴ These not having the force of an Act of Parliament.

⁵ It is not difficult to imagine what result might ensue.

Lord Chichester and Dean Perowne, were on it. The chairman was Archbishop Tait. His fidelity to Protestantism was well known, but he died before the Report was drafted.

This Commission, although composed, as we have seen, almost exclusively of High Churchmen, yet in its recommendations still allowed of an appeal to the Crown from the provincial courts; but the present proposals limit this right in the manner above described, and in certain cases leave the final decision in the hands of the ecclesiastical authority. The Report, in order further to strengthen its own recommendations, quotes the preamble of 24 Hen. VIII. cap. 12, which declares 'that the final determination of matters and jurisdiction to render justice belongs to the King, who, nevertheless, if any causes of the law divine or of spiritual learning happen to come in question, is to have it declared, interpreted, and showed by the spirituality or English Church.' The object of the quotation evidently is to show that the decision on spiritual questions lay through this Act with the Church.

If, however, we examine the history of this Act, as well as the Act itself, we shall find it does not warrant the conclusion it is sought to draw from it. In the first place, when that Bill was first drafted, Henry, who had his own objects in view, urged strongly the sufficiency of the spirituality, because he desired to obtain spiritual sanction for his divorce. But the Act itself is far from establishing the claim of the Church to spiritual jurisdiction.

It appears from many eminent authorities, among whom may be mentioned Lord Campbell, Dr. Phillimore, and Dr. Stubbs, that the 'causes of the law divine or of spiritual learning' alluded to in the Act referred not to spiritual matters at all, but to what we should now call 'temporal' matters. These were tithes, divorce, and money payments to the clergy. Dr. Phillimore and Dr. Stubbs, in the evidence before the Royal Commission, admitted that these three classes of suits, which we should now call 'temporal,' were specifically the classes contemplated by the terms 'causes of the law divine or of spiritual learning,' of which, according to the preamble of this Act, none but a spiritual person might judge. The Act was intended to disallow appeals to Rome in these matters, but still allowed them in all spiritual suits. To quote Lord Campbell:

The 24 Hen. VIII. cap. 12 still allowed an appeal to the Pope in all spiritual suits [*i.e.* in the modern sense of the word 'spiritual'] and it was framed upon the principle that, while all temporal matters which were discussed in the ecclesiastical courts should be finally determined by courts sitting within the realm, the spiritual jurisdiction which belonged to the Pope as supreme head of the Western Church should remain unaffected. Accordingly, this Statute is confined to causes about wills, to causes about matrimony and divorce, and to causes about tithes and oblations."

" Lord Campbell in the Queen's Bench judgment, *Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter*.

But whatever view we may take of this question, the preamble never had the force of an enactment. Dr. Stubbs admits that it is unreasonable to 'read it into' subsequent Acts of Parliament; its recognition of the clergy as constituting 'the Church' has been disallowed by subsequent Acts; it recognises that 'spiritual jurisdiction' belongs to the 'realm,' and is due to 'princes and laws' of the 'realm,' even when exercised exclusively by clergymen; and it provides by authority of Parliament that every priest who refuses to administer Sacraments, &c., on account of excommunications, &c., shall be imprisoned.⁷ So much for the preamble of the Act 24 Hen. VIII.

This Act, however, was superseded by another of far greater importance, which has been well termed the great Reformation Statute. The 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 19 effected a revolution. It gave an appeal to the King in Council in all suits of every kind. In its wide, sweeping language it allowed of 'all manner of appeal of what nature or condition soever they be of, or what cause or matter soever they concern . . . any usage, custom, or prescription to the contrary notwithstanding,' and thus placed the whole spiritual jurisdiction on the foundation of the Royal supremacy—i.e. of the national will expressed through its supreme head. It further provided that no canons should in future be made without the King's assent beforehand and his ratification afterwards. One direct result of this measure was that the study of canon law fell into desuetude. It was prohibited by Royal edict at the universities, who were forbidden to confer degrees in that faculty. It may seem somewhat far-fetched to fear a revival of that canon law which ruled mediæval Europe, but it is a significant fact that proposals have been made to found a chair of canon law in England, and it has been stated that the Bishop of Salisbury has offered to contribute one-half of the endowment. It is also not without interest to note that the celebrated Lambeth judgment of Archbishop Benson in favour of 'lights before the Sacrament' was based upon the authority of a synod held at Oxford in 1222, when the Lateran Decrees were formally promulgated, thus making part of the canon law binding on this country. It is Henry the Eighth that we may thank for relieving us in England of this and all other ecclesiastical burdens. The advocates of ecclesiastical jurisdiction will find no assistance in any of the Acts of his reign. If we once undo his work we shall go dangerously near destroying our Reformation settlement and imperilling our religious liberties.

What, then, is the impression left on the mind by the study of the recommendations of the Royal Commission? The main idea seems to be an endeavour to drive a wedge into the ranks of the Anglican party, to divide it into two groups which might be termed 'reconcilables' and 'irreconcilables.' It is recognised that the latter,

⁷ *Report*, p. 215.

who are evidently looked upon as a small group, must either conform to the law or leave the Church. The other and larger group it is hoped to retain by relaxing the rubrics in their favour. This hope is based on the assumption that there exists in the Church of England a section of people who only desire to give expression to the ceremonial aspect of worship, and who find in that atmosphere aids to the devotional spirit quite apart from any doctrinal significance attaching to it. Such persons, if they exist, cannot be said to belong to what was termed the old High Church school. These people, who took high views on Sacramental doctrines, but not higher than our Prayer-book warrants, and attached immense value to the corporate life of the Church, to her ministry and traditions, yet found in its ritual, when properly carried out, sufficient to satisfy their religious needs. They gloried in the dignified yet simple expression of worship so peculiar to our Church, and would have shrunk back in horror from the quasi-Romish aspect of our modern Ritualistic churches and services. Those who to-day demand more do so because they have reached a different plane of doctrines. The fact is, it is quite impossible to dissociate ritual from dogma. The old High Churchmen held the old traditional High Church doctrines which find ample expression in our own ritual. The modern Ritualist needs more, because that ritual does not express the doctrines he holds. What he wants, and will not rest until he obtains, is liberty to express in his worship those doctrines which he believes unite him to the Catholic Church of pre-Reformation times—which are, in fact, not covered by, but rather carefully excluded from, our formularies. Any attempt to retain such in our Church by making concessions to them is foredoomed to failure. No reform of the rubrics, except in such a sense as would entail disloyalty to our Articles, would satisfy them—no reform of ecclesiastical procedure, unless it resulted in such judgments as would be in harmony with that vague and shadowy phantom to which they are ever appealing—viz. the voice of the Catholic Church. We may take it as an accepted fact that no revision of the rubrics which would satisfy even the less advanced members of the Ritualist party would ever be assented to by the more Protestant section of the Church. In altering them in the interest of the minority, who would have successfully defied their bishops, the law of the land, and the strongly expressed feelings of the community, we should risk the break-up of a Church which in the main is loyal. •

It is, we may be sure, equally certain that, as long as the Church is an Established Church, Parliament will never recede from the Reformation settlement, which in King Henry's Act gave a final appeal to the Crown in all matters in the comprehensive language before quoted.

It will be wisdom on our part to recognise without delay that our Church can only stand as a National Church as long as it is in

conformity with the national will, and that ecclesiastical rule has ever been, and always will be, foreign to our national character. We cannot be coerced by a handful of ecclesiastics, representing but an insignificant minority of the nation. In resisting their claims we can securely count not only on vast numbers in our own Church, but on that large section of the nation which is outside its fold, and to whom the maintenance of the Reformation is just as important as to ourselves. It is not by a retrograde movement in Church life that we shall develop to the full the great governing capacities of this country, but by a reassertion of those vital principles of independence and self-reliance which in the sixteenth century sent our countrymen over sea and land to gain jewels for the British Crown. I cannot for one moment believe that the Parliament of to-day will be less courageous than that which met in England in Henry's time, and which had far greater difficulties than those of the present time to encounter. Of one thing we may be certain—viz. that if Parliament cannot find means for maintaining law in the Church, its disestablishment and disendowment will speedily follow.

CORNELIA WIMBORNE.

THE REPORT ON ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE

II

THE composition of the Commission may add weight and interest to its recommendations ; it certainly renders the free discussion of them extraordinarily difficult. These recommendations are not so much the impartial findings of a court of inquiry, as the declaration of the policy which the heads of the hierarchy, and, what is perhaps even more important, the leaders of the great factions, have decided to pursue. The unanimity of the Commissioners—unquestionably a great triumph for Lord St. Aldwyn—adds much to the difficulty of effective criticism. For the Report goes far beyond the beaten track of official investigation, far beyond the reference with which the Commission was constituted. The Commissioners are not content with ‘inquiring into the alleged prevalence of breaches or neglect of the law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England and to the ornaments and fittings of churches,’ but must needs embark on the vast and misty sea of ecclesiastical antiquarianism. There is something piquant in the aspect of a Blue-book laid on the table of the House of Commons, and adorned with references to the ‘*Peregrinatio Sylviæ*’ (Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 476), ‘*Canons of Athanasius*,’ § 7, 106, Dionys. Areop. *Eccl. Hierarch.* vii. 3, ‘*Liber Pontif.*, ed. Duchesne, vol. i. 174, 227, 233.’ There are many such references, and they convey an impression of much labour and some erudition, but they go far to destroy the effect of the unanimity of the Commissioners. It will not argue any disrespect for the Commissioners, as a body or as individuals, if it be pointed out that for researches into the origins of liturgical forms and ceremonies they cannot fairly be regarded as well equipped. There is but one historical expert in the list, and the reputation of Dr. G. W. Prothero has been gained in departments of historical work which, he would be the first to admit, have very little connection with the investigations into *Origines Liturgicæ*, which the Report presupposes. The Primate’s distinction in the region of ecclesiastical statesmanship explains, but

does not alter, the fact that his Grace is not equally distinguished in the narrower region of sacred archæology. The two Bishops are on many grounds distinguished and respected; but neither is in the first rank of ecclesiastical learning. Sir Lewis Dibdin may be the first of ecclesiastical lawyers, but that circumstance does not necessarily fit him for the delicate and difficult task of appraising the evidence of primitive Christian practice. Sir John Kennaway would add weight to any decision on religious politics, but his name is unknown among the scanty band of original students, and his polemical twin, Mr. J. G. Talbot, can hardly be said to bring any independent authority to the historical judgments he has subscribed. So throughout the list. No statesman stands higher in the confidence and regard of his countrymen than Lord St. Aldwyn, and the other laymen are in their way eminent and respected, but, to speak plainly, none of them, nor all of them together, are really well chosen for the task of deciding difficult and debated historical questions. Moreover, it is not very easy to perceive the relevance of the excursions into primitive history which vary the dry-as-dust monotony of legal discussion. However interesting in itself it may be to know that 'the use of the *Sanctus* bell was first introduced towards the end of the twelfth, and became general during the thirteenth century,' the information must be allowed to be *nihil ad rem* when the question of legality is solely at issue. It may fairly be questioned, indeed, whether the Commissioners have not given an indirect and unintentional encouragement to the very practice which they condemn. By their irrelevant discussions they at least suggest that something turns on the point whether an illegal practice is ancient or comparatively modern, precisely the assumption of the 'Ritualists,' who never fail to plead some kind of an historical justification for their disobedience to the law. Experts are not likely to be affected by judgments which are, from their point of view, no more than the opinions of amateurs, and amateurs are not likely to defer to any but experts. The old warning against giving your reasons applies with special force to the case of a report on matters in which personal preference plays so prominent a part, and which at every turn wakes the passions of religious fanaticism. Unpalatable decisions are all the more easily repudiated when it is seen that they are sustained by reasonings which are apparently fallacious or admittedly doubtful. The gratuitous loquacity of public authorities is one of the most distinctive features of the present time, and adds greatly to the difficult task of securing social order and international peace. It is to be regretted that the Commissioners were so communicative.

A graver fault is the binding up together, under the common description of breaches of the law, of the most innocent and, indeed, unavoidable departures from the letter of the rubrics with illegalities which are neither innocent nor convenient, which are deliberate, and calculated with a purpose which is publicly confessed and persistently

pursued. The suggestion is inevitable, and as unfortunate as inevitable, that the root of the mischief, which the Commissioners were set to investigate, lay in the obsolescence of the rubrics, and not in the policy of lawbreaking which has been adopted by a numerous section of the clergy. The rubrics are obsolete, and obsolete rubrics, *ex hypothesi*, drop out of observance without wakening regrets or causing offence. Our present difficulties have arisen from the historical accident that one particular rubric, perhaps the most absolutely obsolete of all in the view of plain men, appears to offer to the advocates of a Churchmanship which, whatever its merits, is inconsistent with the spirit, history, and standards of the Established Church, the foothold for grafting on to the ecclesiastical system of a reformed communion the abrogated practice of the mediæval Church. The Ornaments Rubric is admittedly the one exception from the reasonable principle which men apply to obsolete laws. As a rule, an obsolete law is left undisturbed on the Statute-book, until some foolish person attempts to enforce it. Then, a practical inconvenience having been demonstrated, the law is abrogated. Why is the Ornaments Rubric treated as if it possessed a title to religious regard unshared by any other rubric? Why cannot the fact that the 'vestments' were, as the Commissioners affirm, 'entirely discarded for 300 years,' demonstrate the obsolescence of the rule that presumably required their use? The attempt to restore them has led to protracted and embittered controversy, and only the paralysis of law, which the Commissioners describe, has made possible their introduction into more than 1,500 churches without other authority than that of the incumbent, and commonly against the ruling of the King's Courts. Why has not the obvious and easy course of passing a declaratory Act been adopted long ago? The reason is obvious. The Ornaments Rubric is the one point at which the solvent of Sacerdotalism can be brought into the Reformed Church; it is the Achilles' heel of the Establishment. Its obsolescence preserves it from being felt as a nuisance by the mass of English Churchmen; its ambiguity paralyses the arm of authority, and adds to reckless individualism the semblance of legality. The Commissioners report that they received a memorial signed by no less than 2,519 clergymen to the effect that the signatories 'conceived it their duty to say that the law imposes upon the clergy the obligation of observing the provisions of the Ornaments Rubric, especially with regard to the use of vestments.' Why should not those clergy be asked to acquiesce in a change of the law, which would, indeed, prohibit the use of vestments, but would enable them, with a good conscience, to bring peace to the Church? The reason is notorious. The plea of legal obligation is not to be supposed to indicate any principle of civic obedience; it is merely a ruse, effective in the rough-and-tumble of popular controversy, but not to be seriously pressed.

The Commissioners—and this is certainly the gravest feature of their Report—are prepared to make terms with the refusal to recognise the authority of the King's Courts.' They appear to endorse the objection to the Ecclesiastical Courts which has been put forward to cover that contempt for legal decisions which has led us into our present confusion, and they propose to remove it by undertaking the complete reconstruction of the judicial system of the National Church. All the quasi-historical disquisitions are designed to predispose the Sacerdotalist clergy in favour of conclusions which are reached along lines of reasoning familiar to themselves, and do, in point of fact, yield the principal matter in dispute. At every turn the High Churchmen's claim is allowed, and the severity with which the Commissioners condemn the silly extravagances of a handful of clergymen cannot obscure the fact that their recommendations surrender the principle at stake, and ask the English people to purchase a doubtful relief from sporadic absurdities by giving national sanction to the Tractarian aspiration of ecclesiastical autonomy.

The craze for autonomy now carries all before it in ecclesiastical circles, and the Report does not escape the prevailing influence. The Commission actually names the 'Houses of Laymen' as if they formed part of the legal constitution of the Church, and were not the effectual instrument for carrying through the policy of denationalising and de-Protestantising the Church of England. The notion of 'a Lay Synod, as *διδάχος* of the Church of England Parliament, which has apostatised, in order to regulate the things indifferent of Church polity,' was started by Richard Hurrell Froude, who thought it a most effective means of disgusting the people with the Establishment. 'I think, if we manage well,' he wrote in 1833, 'we may make the idea of a Lay Synod popular: Its members should be elected by universal suffrage among the communicants, *more primitivo*. I find this view most effective in conversation.' Anyone who reflects on the circumstances of parochial life will readily perceive that the chances of securing an effective representation of the average lay folk by means of such a system as that on which the Houses of Laity are constituted are infinitesimal. Busy men living in the parishes cannot find the time, even if they could find the will, to come to London at every meeting of Convocation, and spend days in discussing subjects which they scarcely understand, and which are discussed in a language wholly technical and remote from their experience. Respectable townsfolk are not willing to be made the sport of the glib stalwarts of the English Church Union, to be proved an *ignoramus* by Mr. Athelstan Riley, and shown to be a fanatic by Lord Halifax. The result is as certain as it is inevitable. The men who are returned to sit in the Houses of Laity are men of leisure, and often men of devotion, but also men whose religion is a kind of hobby, and whose ecclesiastical preferences are more Sacerdotalist than those of the clergy they

patronise. It is not from the Houses of Laity that such contributions of practical good sense as occasionally lighten the debates of the 'Representative Church Council' generally come. The laity speak with ecstatic fervour, and sometimes display an admirable familiarity with theological literature, but the familiar burden of their eloquence is appeals to the clergy to make no surrender, and have done with compromise.

The Commissioners disallow with decision the claim, often heard in recent years, that there is a *jus liturgicum* inherent in the episcopal office, which may be drawn upon to supplement or even replace the law of the land; and they indicate not obscurely their condemnation of the fatuous 'compromises' by which some bishops have attempted to reconcile disobedience of the most provocative kind with those friendly relationships with the rebels which, as 'Fathers in God,' and perhaps also as sympathisers, they so greatly covet. So far so good; but when they reach their recommendations, they have nothing better to propose than a great increase of episcopal authority, and a recognition, tacit but none the less on that account emphatic, of that very character of the episcopal office which has been at the root of all the illegalities, and which received its formulation and advocacy from the Tractarians. It would not be wholly an unfair or unilluminating account of this Report to say that it represents the definite triumph of the Tractarian movement. It is a Tractarian protest against the embarrassing absurdities of the 'Ritualists,' and it is this in spite of the fact that most of the Commissioners would recoil from the notion that they were Tractarians. The effect of the recommendations, assuming the impossible event of their passing into law, would be to transmute the National Church, which for three centuries has borne the character of the 'Head of the Protestant Interest in Europe,' into an Episcopalian Church analogous to that which exists in South Africa, a Church possessed unquestionably of many virtues, and capable of evoking the enthusiastic devotion of many good men, but also narrow and arrogant, and by the very law of its being doomed to grow narrower.

'*Sint ut sunt aut non sint*' was the traditional answer of the Jesuits to every proposal of reformation, and this Report seems to make clear that the attitude of the Sacerdotalist faction might be expressed by the same uncompromising formula. If, indeed, the point at issue were merely practical, an affair of individual extravagancies, of illegality in the simple and common sense of the word, then there would be no necessity for an elaborate project of reconstruction in order to deal with it. It is because two conceptions of Christianity are in conflict within the National Church, the one inherent in the fact of its Reformation, the other implying a repudiation of all that Reformation essentially means, that the situation is so extraordinarily difficult. The Report aspires to cut the Gordian knot by giving the

victory to the party, at the moment prevailing in the ranks of the clergy, which at bottom repudiates that conception of Christianity which inspired the process of Reformation, and shaped the polity of the Protestant Churches. That victory cannot be reconciled with Establishment; it presupposes the surrender of the claim to be the National Church in any intelligible and effective sense. Any serious attempt to restrain Ritualistic vagaries by revising the Established system on Tractarian principles, or, which comes to the same thing, to pass into law the recommendations of the latest Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, will precipitate Disestablishment. The fact that such men as the Commissioners have found themselves compelled by the exigencies of the actual situation to sign this Report, indicates that the way is open for the first statesman who chooses to make his name by drafting and carrying through Parliament a Bill for the destruction of the Church of England as a National Church.

H. HENSLEY HENSON.

THE REPORT ON ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE

III

THE Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline has been received with the respect personally due to its authors, with a full appreciation of their painstaking industry, with ungrudging recognition of their desire to be fair and impartial—not unmixed with some mild curiosity as to the basis of a unanimity that might seem to be of the ‘ditto-to-Mr. Burke’ order. The composition of this august body has from the first been something of a puzzle. It is the fashion among those who wish to commend its conclusions to say that it was representative of all schools of thought in the Church. That is very far indeed from being the case. There was nobody on the High Church side to correspond with so pronounced an Evangelical as the Principal of Ridley Hall, and the opinion has been widely held that the English Church Union had at least as good a right to direct representation as the rather faddist society that advocates so-called ‘Church Reform.’ On the other hand, it is a fact to be placed to the credit of the Commission, jointly and severally, that they determined from the first to begin their inquiry *de novo*, to clear their minds as far as possible from preconceptions, and to give the facts an unprejudiced consideration. That they have, within the necessary limits of human infirmity, realised this high aim is evident on every page of their Report. Whatever judgment may be passed on its concrete conclusions, little fault can be found with its animating spirit.

The generally favourable verdict pronounced by public opinion on the Commission’s fulfilment of its task has been accompanied by an equally general impression that the Report has not arrived *in tempore opportuno*, that it is somehow out of touch with present conditions, that it in some degree jars with the particular mood in which Churchmen of many varying shades of thought find themselves to-day, that it once more drags to the front topics which had of late—rather by a common mute instinct than by any definite mutual understanding—been treated as best left alone.

In brief, the Report—able and honest though it be—is felt to be something of an anachronism. Appearing in 1906, it reflects the thoughts, the temper, the spirit of 1904. Within the short period of two years that has elapsed since the Commission opened its inquiry, a good deal has happened. No one in 1904 anticipated that in 1906 High Churchmen would be taking Bishop Knox for their leader—that Lord Halifax would be the recipient in public of the enthusiastic support of Dean Wace—that the Evangelical clergy would be signing memorials drafted by the E.C.U.—that the *Record* and the *Church Times* would be the twin champions of one cause. It is a commonplace of to-day that the present Government has done more to unify the Church of England, to heal its internal differences, to stiffen its back against external aggression, than could have been effected by any other means.

As with the present, so with the future. The Church of England has, by the political party now in power, been denounced as 'the enemy.' When the attack on the schools has succeeded, the next object of assault is declared to be the four Welsh Sees, whose spoliation is to be merely the first instalment of a general measure of Disestablishment and Depredation. It must needs be that for years to come the forces that have made for co-operation between Catholics and Evangelicals within the English Church will suffer no diminution. The pressure of the assault on the common heritage of the Faith will, as a matter of certainty, bring together those who, after all, are sons of one household. Loyalty to their common creed will issue in loyalty to and appreciation of each other. There will be less and less room for internal controversies—less and less inclination felt by the Churchmen of one school to urge on repressive measures against those of another. The spirit of 1904 is not that of 1906; it will have still less in common with that of 1910.

While little satisfaction is to be derived from the raking-up of old dissensions under new conditions, the public has an uneasy consciousness that the agitation which prompted the appointment of the Commission was largely factitious in its character and not particularly creditable in its origin. The Government of that day created the Commission under Parliamentary pressure from an Orange-Frastian group, backed outside by the crusade of the Kensingtons. The Commission having thus come into being under what may be termed shady circumstances, the humiliating recollection of the awkward facts attending its birth is hardly mitigated by present revelations of the manner of its nurture and upbringing. The Commissioners, with some reluctance, acknowledge themselves compelled to rely in the first instance on the partisan allegations of paid spies—of persons who attended the House of God, not for the purpose of worship, but avowedly to 'get up' the case which their employers instructed them to 'get up.' It is a pleasure to own that the tactics

adopted by these *delatores* were not marked by the gross profanities of former years. Neither the sinister emissaries of the Southwark ecclesiastic who fills the congenial rôle of accuser of his brethren, nor the hireling informers of an association which has little of 'Church' about it except the name, were on this occasion encouraged to approach the Sacrament under the false pretence of Communion, but really to steal it for subsequent utilisation as an 'exhibit' pinned to a paper.

On the other hand, complaints were heard more than once from the inculpated clergy during the progress of the inquiry as to the false witness borne against them by their accusers; the Commissioners report¹ that 'in two cases witnesses admitted conduct on their part' which 'rendered it unfitting that their evidence should be received'; while, in another case, the evidence of a witness was obviously 'inaccurate in so many particulars' that it was 'thought right to disregard it altogether.'

The Commissioners state the point impartially, as was to be expected of them. They are also careful to disclaim having in any case 'invited or instigated anyone to attend Divine Service for the purpose of observation.' On the other hand, the fact remains that the Commission availed itself of the assistance of persons who did this very thing. Indeed, the Report urges apologetically that 'it would have been practically impossible, apart from the evidence which rested on such observation, to ascertain the facts which' the Commissioners 'were appointed to investigate'—a palpable plea, if ever there was one, that the end justifies the means.

It lay doubtless within the discretion of the Commissioners themselves to accept the testimony of these witnesses—somewhat mildly described in the Report as 'not in sympathy with the services they attended'—who, moreover, 'thought it necessary to employ phrases likely to cause unnecessary pain to those to whom their evidence referred,' and by so doing seem in some cases to have drawn from the other side 'language' which the Commissioners 'deprecate.' The point insisted upon here is the purely general one—that the practice and methods of delation, which in France have been regarded by Republicans as detestable even when employed in support of the Republic, are liked no better in England. It is not unfair to say that the case for the repression of alleged irregularities—whatever be its intrinsic merits—is in no wise strengthened by the questionable methods adopted by its self-constituted advocates.

Nor will the public have been slow to take notice that the information concerning breaches of the law on the side of defect was derived, not from High Church spies or informers, but from official sources, such as the Bishops' Visitation Articles and the like.

The mention of illegalities committed by way of defect leads

¹ Report, p. 2.

naturally to the consideration of a third reason why the reception of the Report by the better-informed portion of the public has been marked by so little enthusiasm. It is to be found in the curiously lenient treatment which the Commissioners accord to shortcomings as grave as they are notoriously prevalent—nowhere, indeed, more prevalent than among those who cry out most loudly against errors of excess. The Report is perfectly frank under this head; it hides nothing; it sets down in due order the omission or mutilation of the *Quicumque vult*, the neglect to repeat the words of administration at Communion-time to each individual, the omission of daily service as a practice—not as the occasional result of a ‘reasonable hindrance,’ the omission of service on Ascension Day and on Holy-days, the omission of the Prayer for the Church Militant when there is no Communion, the omission of the whole or a part of what the Report oddly terms the ‘Ante-Communion Service,’ *et cætera*. These matters are the subject of more than passing mention. As regards the gravest of them, a detailed statement is made. A table has been compiled to show, out of the number of churches in each diocese, how many have no daily service, or no Ascension Day service, or no Holy-day service, and a truly surprising table it proves to be.

It is the unenviable distinction of a large proportion of the Anglican clergy that they are the only ministers of any religious cult in the world, Christian or non-Christian, who systematically set at naught their obligations to render public homage to the Deity they profess to worship. How do the Commissioners comment on this grave subject? They busy themselves through many pages of their Report with censures directed against various practices and usages. They express sore displeasure with certain Churchmen who are unable to believe that the body of the Ever-Virgin Theotokos² became a prey to corruption, and who accordingly keep the feast which their forefathers knew as ‘Lady Day in Harvest.’ They are very severe with some whose devotion to the Redeeming Love of Christ takes the concrete form of the worship of His Sacred Heart—a devotion which no more rests (as they suppose) on the visions of Margaret Mary Alacoque than does the observance of Michaelmas postulate a belief in the Apparition of the Archangel on Mount Gargano.³ The

² In an appeal heard by Archbishop Tait in person at Lambeth against the revocation of a curate's license on the ground (among others) of his having, in a sermon, spoken of the Blessed Virgin Mary as the ‘Mother of God,’ it was successfully argued by the present Sir Walter Phillimore that the title of *Theotokos* applied to the Blessed Virgin Mary is recognised by a statute of the realm—1 Eliz. c. 2, § 17 (or § 20 as edited by Stubbs in ‘Hist. App.’ Eccl. Courts Comm. Report, 1883, vol. i. p. 228). The statute makes the first four General Councils, or any of them, one of the standards for determining heresy; and the Second General Council (of Ephesus) condemned Nestorius for denying to the Blessed Virgin Mary the title *Theotokos*.

³ Surely nobody could take offence on theological grounds to the well-known hymn, ‘All ye who seek for sure relief,’ in which the Sacred Heart is mentioned.

Commissioners denounce such illegalities as Corpus Christi 'processions and the rite of Benediction. They mention in order to condemn, as though it could somehow be included under the term 'Invocation of Saints,' a form of petition addressed to Christ to hear the prayers of the Saints—a confusion of thought of which not even a theological tiro should be guilty. The list of things censured is a long one. Nothing is too small for the finely-meshed net of the Commissioners' reprobation. To take a single instance. They solemnly quote the testimony of a witness who himself 'saw a young girl wearing a white veil' pick up a candle 'near the Mary altar' and then place it lighted on a stand! One is tempted to wonder whether the situation could have been saved by the substitution of an old girl with a black veil!

If these and other such things be, as the Commissioners allege, illegal, far be it from any loyal Churchman to approve them. Yet, with no wish to defend anything unlawful, surely a plea may, without offence, be put in on behalf of a sane estimate of relative values. Can any just comparison be drawn between the case of the man who, in the exuberance of his devotion, commemorates the Falling-Asleep—if you will, the Assumption—of Christ's Mother, and that of the man who, in his utter lack of devotion, forbears to commemorate the Ascension of Christ Himself? Yet one or more instances of this grave omission are to be found in every English diocese but three. In the diocese of Carlisle, where only one parish exhibits a Eucharistic vestment, there are actually fourteen churches without an Ascension Day service, 190 in which no service is held on Holy-days, and no less than 241, out of a total of 293, which have no daily service at all. Manchester has nearly as strange a record, with its total of 543 churches in 383 of which daily service is neglected, while 268 have none even on Saints' Days, and thirteen leave Ascension Day unhonoured. Yet, while the Commissioners wax indignant at what are, after all, signs of overzeal, they view these evidences of laxity—irreligion would

* Needless to say, the observance of Corpus Christi has no essential connection whatever with the alleged 'miracle of Bolsena' or any similar legend. Nor does it presuppose any special theological theory respecting the Eucharist.

* No apology can be needed for the reproduction here in substance—it makes no pretence to be a verbatim report—of a portion of a sermon preached by the Rev. A. H. Stanton, of St. Alban's, Holborn:—The point [observed the preacher in effect] is not whether Mary was subjected to an 'assumption' of her body and soul together, but 'hat her 'assumption' was effected—in other words, she was taken home—by her Divine Son. If we were to speak of the 'Assumption' of Our Lord it would be to degrade Him, whereas to speak of the 'Ascension' of Mary would be to deify her. So long as the two ideas are kept quite distinct, the immeasurable gulf between Creator and creature is preserved. If it be true that the Mother of Christ has already received her spiritual crown in heaven, it is equally true that God has promised to all His people that they shall be crowned with Him hereafter. And when, in that supreme ecstasy of their triumph, as it is declared in the Bible, God's redeemed shall cast their crowns down before the Throne of the Lamb, one of those crowns will be Mary's. For it is unthinkable that, when all the faithful receive each one his crown of life from the Lord Christ, the only person who is not to have a crown is the Mother that bore Him.

hardly be too strong a word—without turning a hair. That a parson who is bound by his promise to the Church and his duty to the State to celebrate Divine Service every day twice in his church should defraud God and his parishioners by leaving the parish church unused from Monday morning till Saturday night, is a fact that strikes the Commissioners merely as a 'deviation from the legal standard resulting from negligence or inadvertence,' and as not possessing any further significance! Can it be a subject for wonder if the plain man regards the Report as sadly lacking in indication of a due sense of proportion?

A fourth and widely-felt objection to the Report as a whole is based on an omission in no way attributable to any fault of the Commissioners, who on certain points were not quite free to speak their minds. The King's Commissioners could hardly be expected to criticise the findings of the Judicial Committee of His Majesty's Privy Council.

They have done a tolerably bold thing, as it is, in alluding sympathetically to the conscientious objections entertained by many people, and not improbably shared by some, at least, of the Commissioners themselves, to the lack of spiritual authority in a tribunal that adjudicates on spiritual questions. Whether the Commission's recommendations for the reform of Ecclesiastical Judicature will prove acceptable is too grave and too large a question for discussion here and now. In the view of many, this is by far the most valuable part of the Report, and the recommendation (number 5) on the hearing of doctrinal appeals is well worthy of all consideration.

The one thing the Commissioners were precluded from doing is also the one thing which persons occupying a position of greater freedom and less responsibility are entitled to do, and which imperatively needs to be done. It has become a duty for Churchmen to remind each other and to declare to the world that the prime reason for disobedience to the Ridsdale and other judgments of the Privy Council is that they were felt to be flagrantly unjust and grossly partisan, that they forbade clergymen to do—and punished them for doing—what the Church distinctly and in set terms ordered to be done. No Jesuitical special pleading on the part of any Association can get over the plain, simple, obvious fact that the Church's express rule has in effect had a 'not' read into it, so as to be made to 'mean' the exact contradictory to what it actually says. This may be law, but it is, in the sight of all men, neither truth nor justice. It is an ill time for law when those who are subject to it are made to feel that it contradicts justice and truth. That the distinguished Judges who so 'interpreted' the law were men of the highest probity and unquestioned honour is nothing to the purpose, however interesting from a psychological point of view, as demonstrating the all-powerful supremacy of bias, especially of theological bias, over every rival influence, even in the case of acute and trained intellects.

That ecclesiastical anarchy exists in the Church of England is not far from the truth. Anarchy was born when Justice died. Lawlessness in the Church became inevitable when the Judicial Committee gave Protestant judgments instead of righteous judgments. Lawlessness received a further impetus from the Shortened Services Act of 1872, and the support which it lent to the view that any liberties might be taken with the Prayer-book. To-day, the Commission being our witness, no section of and no grade in the Church of England can claim exemption from the charge of lawlessness. The Commissioners, called in to prescribe a remedy, have made various suggestions. They have laid special stress on the fact that those of their recommendations which would require legislation 'are framed as a complete scheme, and must be considered mutually dependent.' This being so, it is clear that, if a conclusive objection can be established against one of those recommendations, the rest fall with it.

It may be urged, therefore, as a fifth and final ground for declaring the Report impracticable, that the strongest objection lies against the proposal for a new Ornaments Rubric, coupled with modifications in other parts of the Prayer-book designed to secure greater 'elasticity' and 'comprehensiveness.' It is putting no unreasonable gloss on this suggestion to interpret it as an attempt to tinker the Prayer-book, or—more specifically—to arrange a bargain under which High Churchmen are to be indulged with a 'distinctive vesture' for the Communion service, on the condition that they will consent to an authorised modification in the use of the *Quicumque vult*.

As to which precious proposal it is necessary to make only these two observations: First, that the whole Evangelical party have already emphatically declared that they will have none of the former half of it—a conclusion arrived at, though on different premisses, by a vast proportion of High Churchmen also; and, secondly, that a solid phalanx of the Catholic school, to which is joined a very large number of men of so-called 'moderate views,' backed by a goodly company of Evangelicals, is finally determined to stand no tampering with the Prayer-book, and especially with the *Quicumque vult*.

Of those who are unable to endorse the recommendations embodied in the Report, the inquiry is sure to be made: What, then, is to be done? The question may be answered by asking another: Is it necessary to 'do' anything at all—in the sense in which the term 'doing' is understood in this connection? The better course for would-be fishers of men is to abstain from upsetting one another's boats and from tearing each other's nets to pieces. Let each, by scrupulous deference to the Prayer-book as it stands, help in forming an atmosphere of obedience in which loyalists of every school may breathe and live and move in confidence and in freedom.

THE REPORT ON ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE

IV

THE unanimous Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline is a document of such grave interest and significance that it must directly produce legislation of some kind, and may ultimately lead to the disestablishment of the Church. For, though the Commission was appointed by the late Government, and was not so impartially selected as it might have been, the undue preponderance of High Churchmen upon it makes its exposure of Ritualism the more emphatic, and no Ministers of the Crown can disclaim responsibility for an Established Church which is almost a part of the Constitution. If, as I suppose, Mr. Balfour selected the Commissioners, he may be congratulated upon his choice of a Chairman. Few men would carry more weight in the opinion of lay Churchmen than Lord St. Aldwyn, and the innuendo that he delayed the issue of the Report on political grounds connected with the Education Bill is ridiculous. It is more plausible, and not unnatural, to suggest that the Commissioners sacrificed something for the sake of unanimity, and that many of them would willingly have signed a stronger condemnation of Romanism in the Church of England. The appointment of the Archbishop of Canterbury was a matter of course. But it is unlucky that the Bishops of Oxford and Gloucester, both pronounced High Churchmen, should have been the only other prelates on the Commission, while the exclusion of the Bishop of Hereford is too marked to have been accidental. At the same time, when the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chief Justice, and the Dean of the Arches all sign a Report, their recommendations cannot be neglected, nor their opinion ignored. The following words are a challenge to Parliament, and in the course of the next Session that challenge must be taken up :

We think . . . that occasions have arisen more often than has been realised by the Bishops when the interests of the Church and her due administration demanded that discipline should be enforced by action in the Ecclesiastical Courts. The deliberate persistence, in spite of a Bishop's monition, in practices significant of teaching repudiated by the Church of England ought to be met by an attempt at least to assert in a constitutional way the Church's claim to obedience.

If such attempts failed, the case for reorganisation of the Ecclesiastical Courts would be strengthened. But the fact that reforms are needed is not an adequate reason for allowing defiant lawlessness to go unchecked pending their adoption.

Some of us would say that in an Establishment obedience to the law ranked even higher than obedience to the Church, whatever 'the Church' may in this connection mean. It must always be borne in mind that every beneficed clergyman has twice taken an oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop of his diocese: once when he was ordained a deacon, and again when he was ordained a priest. If the incumbent be allowed to define the limits of canonical obedience for himself, the oath ceases to have any meaning, and is one more example of the fact that all religious tests are futile. Surely it may with perfect fairness be argued that if a clergyman will not follow the pastoral injunctions of his Father in God, and chooses rather to take his stand on his legal rights as an English citizen, he must acknowledge the jurisdiction of the King's Courts on pain of forfeiting the privileges he has abused. The case of the 'passive resister' is not in point. The passive resister was not established and endowed.

The Commissioners have drawn up a list of illegal practices which they regard as especially grave and significant. I will not transcribe them all, because some of them deal with very sacred things and are held in solemn reverence by Roman Catholics. But 'the interpolation of prayers and ceremonies belonging to the Canon of the Mass' is quite beyond the limits of tolerance in the Protestant Church of England, being, as the Commissioners observe, both illegal, and inconsistent with the Book of Common Prayer. The Commissioners leave out of their category the use of unlawful vestments, apparently because they are unwilling to acknowledge the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It is of course well known that the decision of the Judicial Committee in the leading case of *Clifton v. Ridsdale* has been bitterly assailed and some parts of it, though not the part concerning vestments, are difficult to reconcile with the later judgment of the same tribunal in *Read v. the Bishop of Lincoln*. But for a Royal Commission to impugn the authority of the King in Council is a novel and a startling development of clericalism in strange places. Nor should it be forgotten that the Judicial Committee is a statutory body, having the direct sanction of Parliament, which is all that can be claimed for the Supreme Court of Judicature itself. The final Court of Appeal for the British Empire beyond the seas may be assumed without paradox to be capable of interpreting a rubric, if not of expounding a dogma. There is one sentence in this Report which possesses great historic interest, as a striking contrast with the attitude hitherto held by High Churchmen in England towards Presbyterianism in Scotland:

In an age which has witnessed an extraordinary revival of spiritual life and activity the Church has had to work under regulations fitted for a different

condition of things without that power of self-adjustment which is inherent in the conception of a living Church, and is, as a matter of fact, possessed by the Established Church of Scotland.

Lord Halsbury, when he delivered judgment in the case of the Scottish Churches, seemed to think that a Church which could alter its doctrines was no Church at all. The Commissioners take precisely the opposite view, and even hold up a Church without a Bishop as a model of spiritual vitality. If there were any real analogy between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, this fact would be both relevant and important. But there is none. In Scotland all Presbyterians, whether they belong to the Established Church or to the United Free Church, profess the same doctrines, and adopt the same methods of ecclesiastical government. In their General Assemblies lay Elders sit alongside of Ministers, and vote with them on a footing of perfect equality, which is the essence of Presbyterianism. The two Houses of Convocation in England, representing the separate and independent provinces of Canterbury and York, are exclusively clerical. Indeed, they are even narrower than that. For unbeneficed clergymen, commonly, though not quite accurately, called curates, have no more voice in the election of Proctors than the laity themselves. The 'Houses of Laymen' are merely debating societies, with a marked tendency to self-advertisement. If Letters of Business were issued to the Convocations, as the Commissioners recommend, they would be issued to clergymen only, and in the opinion of the Attorney-General the Convocation of Canterbury would not be able to vote with the Convocation of York. Sir John Walton seemed to think that they might vote separately, and deliberate in common. Inasmuch, however, as no such joint session has occurred since the thirteenth century, its legality may well be doubted. The suggestion that they should 'take counsel with the Houses of Laymen' must have been made in temporary forgetfulness of the fact that Convocation cannot go beyond the scope of the commission it receives from the Crown without defying the Royal supremacy, and thus incurring the penalties of *præmunire*.

We desire [say the Commissioners] to place on record our conviction that the evidence gives no justification for any doubt that in the large majority of parishes the work of the Church is being quietly and diligently performed by clergy who are entirely loyal to the principles of the English Reformation as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer.

This is undoubtedly true, and it should never be forgotten that some of the best clergymen in the Church of England, men whose lives are examples of every Christian virtue, never come before the public at all. But a large majority is quite compatible with a large minority, and the evidence given before the Commission, minimised rather than maximised, as Bentham would say, in the Report, will show that the number of persistently refractory incumbents is much greater than

had been supposed. Take London alone. It is notorious that the late Archbishop Temple, when he was Bishop of London, allowed Ritualistic practices to grow and flourish under his eyes unchecked. This was certainly not the result of indolence, for there never was a more strenuous prelate. It was the fruit of deliberate policy. Dr. Temple was by nature a Liberal, and he had himself been subject, not indeed to prosecution, but to violent, irrational abuse, because of the article he wrote in *Essays and Reviews*. He made up his mind that so long as his clergy did their work he would let them alone, and not suffer them to be brought before the Courts on account of ecclesiastical irregularities. The failure of the Public Worship Act helped him, and the public had much confidence in the robust integrity of his character. When he was translated to Canterbury, his successor, Bishop Creighton, found himself much embarrassed by the legacy of unsettled cases which Dr. Temple had left him, and by the gathering indignation of the Protestants in his diocese. Dr. Creighton's cleverness was extraordinary, and his personal kindness to those who came in contact with him gave him a very remarkable influence. Yet he failed to secure universal obedience, and the Commissioners find that he was not in fact even so successful as he supposed. His premature death was an irreparable loss to the Church, and the present Bishop of London does not inspire educated laymen with absolute confidence. He has adopted a singular method of dealing with clergymen who do not obey him or the law. He does not, like the Pope, lay them under an interdict. He places them 'under discipline,' refusing to visit their churches, even for the confirmation of children, or to renew the licenses of their curates. A more futile acknowledgment of episcopal impotence could hardly be imagined. One London clergyman whose church the Bishop said publicly that he would not visit observed dryly, 'He'd better wait till he's asked.' The churches now 'under discipline' are St. Peter's, London Docks; St. Mary Magdalen's, Paddington; St. Mary's, Edmonton; St. Augustine's, Stepney; St. Michael's, North Kensington; and St. Clement's, City Road. These things are not done in a corner.

The practical Recommendations of the Commissioners, some of which are rather surprising, could not be adopted without an Act of Parliament, which would bring the whole condition of the Church before the House of Commons. Almost everyone, except a small knot of extreme High Churchmen, will agree with the Commissioners that the illegal practices described by them in detail 'should be promptly made to cease by the exercise of the authority belonging to the Bishops, and, if necessary, by proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts.' Inasmuch, however, as some of the Bishops have more sympathy with the culprits than they have with the law, the practical difficulties are considerable. The second paragraph of the Report is the one dealing with Convocation and with Letters of Business. Before they issue

these Letters, of which the legal effect is extremely doubtful, and may be nugatory, the Government would do well to pause and reflect. It is not an easy thing to pass an ecclesiastical measure through the House of Commons. The present House will not receive such a Bill more sympathetically because it is recommended by Convocation. Most Liberal Churchmen probably agree that the revival of Convocation which Bishop Wilberforce obtained from Lord Palmerston was a serious blunder. It had not met for a century and a quarter, not since the Bangorian controversy, and what it has done in the last forty years for the Church or the nation neither the Church nor the nation knows. It is totally disconnected with the laity, few clergymen pay much attention to it, and it would not be a bad thing to require that the Proctors should conduct their debates in Latin when they solemnly turn a *gravamen* into an *articulus cleri*. Whatever the Government may propose, they should bring, on the responsibility of the Cabinet, before Parliament as the trustees of a Church which, so long as it remains established, is a national institution. I am quite sure that they will not propose, for the House of Commons would never adopt, the reference of any charges brought before an ecclesiastical court to an assembly of bishops, perhaps the least judicial among all the orders of men.

The Public Worship Act of 1874, commonly attributed to Archbishop Tait, but really in substance the work of Lord Shaftesbury, makes the consent of the Bishop necessary to a prosecution for ritual. The Commissioners advise the repeal of the Act. The House of Lords has decided that the episcopal veto may equally be exercised under the Church Discipline Act of 1840. The Commissioners recommend that the veto should be abolished. It has been exercised with flagrant unwisdom, so that clergymen who 'obey God rather than man,' or in other words do as they like, are safe in the last resort from the only authority which can enforce its decrees. It is reasonable that the Court itself, subject to appeal, should have the power of staying frivolous or vexatious suits. I remember hearing Bishop Mackarness tell the Judges of the Queen's Bench that he had been asked to prosecute a clergyman for not giving notice of the festival of St. Simon and St. Jude. At the same time the expense of these prosecutions is a more than adequate deterrent in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. Nobody ever succeeds in 'cutting down lawyers' fees. This expense ought not to fall upon the Bishops, who have a far better use for their money, and the promoters of ecclesiastical suits may fairly be asked to give security for costs. Even the episcopal veto has not been a more formidable barrier to the vindication of the law than the punishment of ritualistic clergymen by sending them to gaol. Five-and-twenty years ago a handful of clerical nonentities became heroes and martyrs because they had been imprisoned by Lord Penzance. The Commissioners most sensibly recommend the substitution of

deprivation for imprisonment. A clergyman of the Church of England accepts a benefice on condition that he will obey the ecclesiastical law as expounded by the King's Courts. If he subsequently refuses to do so, he has no right to complain because his benefice is taken from him. This Recommendation, with the abolition of the veto, are the substance of Mr. Austin Taylor's Bill, which he brought into the last Parliament, and has reintroduced in this. There seems to be no obvious reason why the present House of Commons should refuse to pass it. The idea of a new Ornaments Rubric for the total or partial recognition of 'vestments' is, on the other hand, chimerical and visionary. The House of Commons has something better to do than to regulate ecclesiastical millinery. The only change in the rubric likely to be carried is the removal of the Athanasian Creed, for which, I believe, St. Athanasius is in no way responsible.

But of course no reasonable man can shut his eyes to the fact that any Bill to carry out this Report, or any single paragraph of it, will be accompanied by a demand for disestablishment. The Liberation Society has not gained ground of late years. In many respects the Church of England is very different from what it was thirty years ago. The clergy are much poorer. The Bishops lead simpler and more frugal lives. No young man in his senses would now take Orders as a comfortable provision in life. If the intellectual standard of the clerical profession has not been raised, its moral standard never stood so high as it stands to-day. At the same time there is a fatal discrepancy between the vast majority of lay Churchmen and a considerable minority of clergymen who call themselves 'Anglican Priests.' The laity are quite determined that the Church shall remain Protestant. Ritualists abhor the word, describe themselves as Catholics, and seek to dismiss the great ecclesiastical dominion which is really entitled to that name with the contemptuous epithet 'Roman.' They are like the parson in *Lothair*, whose friends thought that he would 'go over to Rome.' They underrated, says Disraeli, the exuberant priestliness of the man. He thought that Rome should come to him. Even Mr. Gladstone persuaded himself in his old age that the Pope would 'recognise Anglican orders,' and that it really mattered whether he did or not. If the Church is disestablished, the operation will be performed, or at least the motive power will come, from within, and not from without. It was the Romanising clergy who caused the appointment of this Commission, and Disestablishment has been revived as a practical issue by the publication of this Report.

It has also been stimulated by the attitude of some High Churchmen towards the Education Bill, which now lies for second reading in the House of Lords. If this Bill had been treated as a purely political measure, dividing parties in the House of Commons and the country, the Church of England, which contains at least as

many Liberals as Conservatives, might not have been especially concerned. Liberal Churchmen are perfectly satisfied with the religious teaching in Council schools. They regard it as slightly profane, and highly absurd, to call Christianity 'Cowper-Templeism.' But a small compact body of sacerdotalists, mainly though not exclusively clerical, have arrogated to themselves the right of speaking in the name of the Church, and have put forward claims which are odious to the great mass of their Protestant fellow-countrymen. Lord Hugh Cecil, who knows as much about children as I know about patristic theology, writes to the *Westminster Gazette* that every child is born in a state of moral leprosy which he calls sin, and can only be rescued by a dogmatic process technically known as 'grace.' The grace of God can do anything. It does not allow children to be born moral lepers, and it does not work through the means provided by Lord Hugh Cecil. I cannot believe that even Lord Hugh, though he talks about 'gambling in souls,' supposes that the Almighty punishes boys and girls for having been educated in Council schools, or County Councils for having educated them there. If any such doctrine could with the faintest plausibility be attributed to the Church of England, as of course it cannot, most Churchmen would become Dissenters tomorrow. We all understand the position of Roman Catholics. They believe in an infallible Church, with an infallible Head at Rome, which has the sole right of interpreting the ways of God to man as set forth in the Bible or elsewhere. Protestants believe in neither one nor the other. Private judgment, guided, of course, by knowledge and wisdom, is as essential to Protestantism as an open Bible, which has its own lessons for the human mind. These, it may be said, are private and personal questions, with which a stranger should not intermeddle. But then Lord Hugh Cecil and his friends have chosen to proclaim the contrary position, and to assert, at least by implication, that no one has a right to remain in the Church of England who does not agree with them. If they are indeed the Church, the Church as a national institution is at an end. The Church of England has endured and flourished because it afforded ample scope and latitude for all varieties of Protestant opinion, from the Highest of the High to the Broadest of the Broad. If it is to sink into a small 'Anglican' clique, its severance from the State, as from the main body of English opinion, will be speedy, definite, and complete.

HERBERT PAUL.

THE POLITICAL POWERS OF LABOUR

THEIR EXTENT AND THEIR LIMITATIONS

I

WHAT IS MEANT BY LABOUR IN CURRENT CONTROVERSY

THE presence in Parliament, for the first time in any considerable numbers, of a party claiming *par excellence* to represent what is called Labour, is a fact whose significance has been thus far very inaccurately understood both by the Labour members themselves and by others who either sympathise with or are hostile to them. This misunderstanding has in each case the same origin, which consists of the looseness of the ideas associated with the word 'labour.' Labour, of course, means some form of human activity, or it means nothing, but it is evident also that, as used in the present connection, the form of activity meant by it must be of some special and limited kind. Otherwise a party which claimed to represent Labour would not be specifically distinguishable from a party, for example, which represented the interests of active capital. What, then, in the minds of the Labour members themselves does labour stand for as that which is specially and distinctively represented by them?

It would be difficult to give a definition of this which did not require qualifications in respect of exceptional cases; but, broadly speaking, we may say that it means for them first and foremost what is commonly called manual labour. But here at once the need for exceptions arises. The writing of a book, the drafting of an Act of Parliament, the painting of a great picture, all involve labour of the hands. The painting of a picture is essentially inseparable from this. But the Labour members in Parliament certainly do not claim to represent the interests of a Millais or an Alma-Tadema. The root idea which the Labour members form of labour may be best described as those forms of muscular and manual activity of which all normal men are capable to an approximately equal degree, and which the majority of men in all ages have, from the nature of things, been obliged to exercise. Such labour, no doubt, approximately equal though it may be in a general way, admits of, and requires

different degrees of skill; and we find in labour, consequently, certain different grades, which are elicited in accordance with the talents of the individual labourers. So much our Labour members would without doubt concede; but all forms of labour, according to their conception of it, are alike in this—that each is an exertion of manual and muscular energy on the part of men as individuals, which is applied to the performance of separate industrial tasks. That such is the conception of Labour prevalent among the party as a body is illustrated by the occupations of the great majority of its members. According to an interesting statement published in the *Review of Reviews* for June, eleven of them are coal-miners; six are mechanics employed in various metal industries; four are mill hands; four are farm-labourers; three are railway employees; there is a barge-builder, a bootmaker, a stonemason, several printers' employees, and a maker of watch-cases. In men thus occupied we have the bulk of the party, and it is in virtue of occupations such as these that they make their claim to represent labour directly.

Labour, then, translated from abstract into concrete terms, means that section of the population whose one distinguishing characteristic consists in this—that its members individually devote to individual industrial tasks those manual and muscular energies which such tasks demand, and in respect of which all normal men are, approximately at least, equal. Members of this class may have other faculties also, as, indeed, of course, they have; but, in so far as such faculties are those which are possessed and exercised by the human race generally, these faculties are in no way distinctive of the labouring class as such. They belong to its members as representatives, not of labour, but of humanity. On the other hand, if members of the labouring class, as many doubtless do, possess, in addition to the average faculties of labour, faculties of other kinds, which are above the average and exceptional, such men represent in virtue of these, not the labour which makes the whole class one, but some kind of superiority which separates a part of that class from the rest of it. Thus the mining population in Wales enjoys the reputation of possessing exceptional gifts for music; but the miners who have been sent to Parliament by the Welsh mining constituencies lay no claim to represent the distinctive interests of musicians. If labour stands for anything distinctive of any comprehensive class, and if the Labour members represent this class in any distinctive sense, the word labour, as used in current political discussion, means the application of ordinary hands and muscles to tasks of the kind just indicated—such as the extraction of so much coal, the hammering of so many rivets, the setting up of so much type, or the ploughing of so many furrows. It is only by using the word labour in this specific sense that such phrases as 'the Labour members,' 'the Labour party,' or 'the cause of labour' can have any specific meaning. And such is the sense,

though for the most part not consciously defined, which is actually attributed to the word in the political discussion of to-day, both by the public generally and by the Labour members themselves.

II

ILLUSIONS OF LABOUR AS TO THE NATURE OF ITS OWN IMPORTANCE

What, then, is the real significance of the rise of the Labour party? Within what limits does it stand for a legitimate political force, with reasonable and practicable ends? And how far do its own ambitions and the fears of those who are out of sympathy with it, lie beyond the region of what is inherently possible? We shall find that for a party representing the interests of labour as such, there is a very distinct and legitimate field of action; but the more clearly we realise what the character of this field is, the more clearly shall we realise how far outside its borders the aspirations of many of the Labour members lie, and how much smaller is the efficient force at the back of them, than they themselves, or than those who fear them, suppose.

The intelligible and legitimate functions which may conceivably be fulfilled by a party representing the interests of the labouring as distinct from all other classes, are obvious enough, as a few examples will show us, and arise from the broad fact that a variety of social questions really do concern the labouring classes either exclusively or in a special way. Thus the fencing of machinery in factories, the construction of factories with due regard to sanitation, the obligation of employers to compensate employees injured in their service, the limitation of the normal labour day, the recognition of such rights as are incident to collective bargaining—all these are matters which concern the labouring classes in a special and direct way in which they concern no others. There is, therefore, in Parliament a legitimate *locus standi* for a party which distinguishes itself from all other parties by representing, as distinguished from the interests of all other classes, the peculiar interests of the classes who live by manual labour.

Such being the case, then, the presence in Parliament of a party which differed from other parties only in this one particular, that it concerned itself more specially than they with matters of the kind just indicated, would not be in itself a feature in our political life to which, on general grounds, it would be possible to take exception. But the claims of the Labour party, and the ideas of its members and their supporters, are far from being limited by this sober view of the situation. Mixed with claims and ideas which will generally be admitted as reasonable are others of a more ambitious and also of a more disputable character. Thus, with the idea that the special

interests of labour require to be represented by members who make them their main concern is associated with the idea that the members who represent these can only do so adequately if they are themselves manual labourers. Again, with the idea that the special interests of labour require more consideration than they have generally received hitherto is associated the idea that these interests are entitled to some privileged position—as though because such and such men belong to the labouring classes acts should be legal on their part which are not legal for others. The vitality of this idea has been illustrated in an interesting way by the demands of the Labour party with regard to the right of picketing. They and their friends in the Government disguise the nature of these demands under the plausible doctrine that it ought not to be illegal for men to perform any act collectively which is legal for each singly; and one of the spokesmen of the Government elicited uproarious applause by what was supposed to be an absolutely convincing illustration. No one, he said, would maintain that an upper housemaid was committing an illegal act if she left her situation on the ground that she did not like the butler. Would anyone, the speaker continued, be foolish enough to maintain that what was legal for one housemaid, so long as she acted for herself, ought to be made illegal if the other housemaids were to join with her? A far closer parallel to the practice of picketing would have been the following. It is legal for any one member of Parliament to walk by himself down Parliament Street; it is also legal for any two to walk down it arm-in-arm; but if ten members were to walk down it linked together, sweeping the pavement, and thrusting everyone else into the roadway, such a corporate act, were it not illegal already, would certainly be made so with very little delay. The hollowness of the arguments put forward in this connection by the Labour party and their friends would have been plain to everybody—indeed, the arguments could hardly have been used—if it had not been for the underlying idea that any claim advanced in the special interest of Labour is *prima facie* a just claim, and that any arguments supporting it must for that reason be sound.

But the disputable ideas of the Labour party do not end here—with the idea that the interests of manual labour as such have a right to preferential treatment. They are reinforced by one of very much wider scope. This is that the classes whose one class distinction is that they live by labour whilst other classes do not, ought to possess, and will possess in the future, a preponderant control over the entire affairs of the nation. The ideal Government which, more or less vaguely conceived, the Labour party have in view, is, indeed, a Government consisting of labouring men—of men generically distinguished from statesmen of all other types by the fact that their normal occupation is the performance of manual tasks. An American writer has recently illustrated this fact by solemnly observing, with

a mixture of alarm and sympathy: 'The Government of Great Britain will, at no distant date, be administered exclusively by men working with their hands.'

Ideals, ambitions, and prophecies such as these, though they may seem absurd to some and dangerously insane to others, cannot profitably be dismissed or met by ridicule or by crude defiance. However false, and consequently dangerous, they may be, their significance, great or small, can be properly estimated only by a careful and calm examination of the sources from which they spring. This examination will bring us back to the point which I set out with elucidating—namely, the nature and scope of those activities which are meant by the term 'labour.'

III

THE DEPENDENCE OF LABOUR ON ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN ITS OWN

Labour as we defined it, and as it is undoubtedly conceived by the Labour members themselves and illustrated by their own occupations—namely, manual labour, of a more or less ordinary kind, as applied to individual tasks—has two distinguishing characteristics. All normal human beings of sufficient age are capable of it; and in every community it must be exercised by all or by a great number, as the primary condition which enables such a community to exist. The whole means of life, then, in a certain sense, are based on labour. If we put the bearing and the rearing of children aside, every form of activity except labour may be absent, and a community may yet, within certain limits, flourish; but if labour be absent, the community must cease to be; and no other kinds of activity are able to accomplish anything. Labour, therefore, stands for the majority of any given population in the first place; and it stands, in the second place, not for the majority only, but for a majority performing the one fundamental function which alone is universally necessary for the existence of the human race.

Hence, by a process of thought which is very simple and intelligible, the idea has arisen that, in all conditions of society (even those in which the production of wealth has been most highly developed), labour and the labouring classes represent, if not all, yet nearly all, of the human activities to which the wealth of the community is due. Other classes may possibly add something to the result; but the efficiency of these depends on the class that labours. The efficiency of the class that labours does not depend on these.

Now, as applied to certain conditions of society, this conception of labour would theoretically be true enough. Where all productive processes are carried on by individuals, either working singly or else in very small groups (as still happens in savage or semi-savage com-

munities), the total product depends on the industrial efficiency of individuals, and bears a direct proportion to it. Even in such cases, however, this, as history shows us, has been true in an abstract rather than in a concrete sense. If all the members of one tribe had devoted themselves to industry, whilst half the members of a neighbouring tribe devoted themselves to the art of fighting, the former would in theory have twice as much wealth as the latter; but in practice the latter would undoubtedly have seized on the wealth of the former. Labour, therefore, in relation to actual social life, has, even in cases where theoretically its importance is greatest, not possessed the exclusive importance which certain thinkers assign to it. But waiving such considerations with regard to military efficiency, which I have used only as a passing illustration, let me go on to observe that, in exact proportion as labour is, in an economic sense, the main factor in production, it is inefficient, and the product is small; whilst in proportion as it becomes a subordinate factor, though it can never cease to be a necessary one, the productive power of the community, as a whole, increases. Manual labour, in short, as related to the facts of progress, is simply the productive unit, which is multiplied by other forces; and these other forces consist of the various faculties and activities by which manual labour is directed and co-ordinated. In other words, labour, as such, is essentially non-progressive. The extremes of manual skill, as devoted to individual tasks, were reached very early in the history of civilisation. They are to be found in savage tribes to-day. The relation of labour to the causes of industrial progress may be illustrated by a comparison between a geographical treatise written and printed to-day, and one written and printed, let us say, in the time of Aldus. The former would, of course, as compared with the latter, represent an immense advance in geographical knowledge, and this enlarged knowledge would be conveyed to us by means of the printed characters. But so far as these characters themselves were concerned, the compositors of Aldus would have done their work as well as the compositors of to-day. The modern treatise would be superior to the old one, because the movements of the compositors' hands had been made in accordance with a new set of instructions given, through his manuscript, by a man in possession of new knowledge. The work of the compositors may stand for the non-progressive efficiency of labour. The superiority of the new treatise to the old one may stand for the progressive forces by which manual labour is directed. The same thing holds good of all the advances that have been made in manufacturing machinery, in applied chemistry, in locomotion, the transmission of news, and so forth. Progress in all these cases has resulted not from any new dexterity on the part of manual labourers, but from new directions being imposed on the movements of innumerable hands, whose strength and precision to-day are no more than they were yesterday. And

to this progressive work of directing each pair of hands singly must be added the work of co-ordinating the operations of innumerable pairs, so that they may eventuate in some one result.

Now, such being the case, as all industrial history shows us, whilst the faculties involved in labour are, to speak broadly, common to the human race, the faculties involved in the progressive direction of labour develop themselves in a minority only, and the highest of these, the most important and the most far-reaching in their effects, develop themselves only in a minority that is very small. 'The progress of industry, for example, as Herbert Spencer has pointed out, is largely based on mathematics of an abstruse kind, which, as our university examinations show, only a few of those most favourably circumstanced can master. No doubt to an eye that does not pierce below the surface of things, the building of an Atlantic liner and the navigating of it between England and America seem to be entirely the work of manual labour—of such labour as the Labour members claim to represent in their own persons; but it requires the exertion of very little intelligence to see that such labour is merely the tool of other faculties that lie behind it—the faculties of the mathematician, the astronomer, the chemist, the master of applied science, of the great industrial organiser, which are in their highest and most efficient developments not found in one man out of a thousand.

It is needless and impossible here to elaborate this fact farther. It is enough to say briefly that the faculties which make labour progressively efficient, which maintain its increased efficiencies and alone prevent them from disappearing, are not only incomparably rarer than manual labour itself, but differ from it essentially in this fundamental particular—that whereas manual labour, as such, is the work of the single labourer engaged on a single task, the directing faculties operate simultaneously on an indefinite number of labourers, making to each a loan of the same kind of added efficiency.

The result is that those classes or persons, in whom the directing and organising faculties are most successfully embodied, contribute an element to the productive power of a country out of all proportion to their number, which, compared with that of the labourers, is, as I have said, small. How, then, as social forces, do these two classes stand related? If we suppose them, in preparation for some act of formal antagonism, to be estimating the strength of their respective positions, the following assertions on either side will express the true nature of the situation. Labour will be able to say for itself: 'I am the prime essential. I can exist in the absence of directing talent. I did so for thousands of years before directing talent arose. But directing talent is powerless without *me*.' On the other hand, the directing classes will be able to say to the labouring: 'You may paralyse us, but you will not be emancipating yourselves. We do not make you toil. What makes you toil is Nature. We

find the majority of mankind labouring with its hands and muscles owing to the same compulsion that makes the earth rotate and rivers flow downwards to the sea. You will have to labour, whether we direct you or no ; but if we do not direct you, you will only have to work the harder. In some countries, no doubt, you could continue, on these terms, to exist ; but in thickly peopled countries such as England even existence would be impossible for something like two-thirds of you. If, when you talk about the interests of labour, what you have in view is a gradual amelioration of the general conditions of toil, and an increase in your own share of those material goods which constitute the results of the general industrial process, you can hope for this only through co-operation of the directing classes, on whose activity the progressive efficiency of the industrial process depends.'

In so far, then, as the Labour party of to-day really does what it purports to do—in so far as it represents the interests of labour as distinct from other interests, and opposed to them, it represents only a very small fraction of those interests and activities which are essential to its own welfare.

To this it is possible that the apologists of labour may answer, ' We do not ignore or underrate the importance of the directing and organising talents ; but we claim that, amongst our ranks, we possess these talents ourselves.' Now, such an argument, if seriously put forward, is, as we shall see presently, a complete abandonment of the labour position, as at present popularly understood. It deserves, however, to be carefully considered ; and all that I have thus far said has been leading up to it.

IV

WHO DOES THE LABOUR PARTY OF TO-DAY REALLY REPRESENT ?

Spinoza was one of the world's greatest thinkers. He was also a manual labourer, whose occupation was grinding lenses. Rousseau was a thinker who, in a sense, was more influential than Spinoza. For a time he was a manual labourer who lived by copying music. But no one would say that Spinoza, in his doctrines as to God and substance, or even that Rousseau, in his theory of the origin of society, represented manual labour as embodied in opticians or copyists. The fact that they happened to be manual labourers was an accident ; and their influence had nothing to do with the practice of their respective trades. In the same way it is possible, and indeed highly probable, that amongst the labouring classes of this country to-day there may be all kinds of exceptional talent maturing themselves which will make their possessors influential in other ways than that of labour. But in whatever cases such a development takes place, and in so far as it takes place, the men who acquire influence of the kinds

in question. cease in any direct sense to represent ordinary labour, and represent instead one or more of the exceptional qualities, such as intellect, sagacity, imagination, strength of will, or knowledge, to which the influence of all influential men has been due, from the Cæsars, the Napoleons, the Platos, the Shakespeares, and the Newtons downwards. Our Labour members, in so far as they are men with any special aptitudes for politics, may indeed give expression to the desires of the labouring classes; but they do not, in virtue of being manual labourers themselves, represent average labour in any more direct way than Lord Shaftesbury did two generations since. Their special qualifications as legislators arise from their possession of qualities in which they differ from the ordinary workman, not from those in which they resemble him. Let us, then, ask what, so far as we are in a position to judge, the special qualities are with which the present Labour representatives are equipped for their work as legislators? And we may ask this question in no offensive spirit, because the only fact on which it will be necessary for us to dwell is not positive or personal, but purely general and negative.

Let us assume that these representatives are men as amply endowed as are capable politicians of any other class, with those general political talents which deserve and command distinction. It is probable that many of them are in this way really exceptional. But whatever may be the higher gifts of intellect and talent represented by them, there are certain talents and capacities, intimately connected with the welfare of the labouring, as of all other classes, in which they are, one and all of them, conspicuously and almost avowedly deficient. In addition to being, as we assume them to be, men of exceptional talents generally, they are doubtless in their own trades capable and honest labourers; but there are certain faculties to which no one of them makes the slightest claim, and of which no one of them, so far as we can judge, possesses even the germ; and these are those faculties of direction, of industrial organisation, and of enterprise on which the whole efficiency of labour in a society such as ours depends.

In saying this I am not speaking at random. I have referred already to an account of the Labour members, published in *The Review of Reviews*, and compiled from information furnished by the Labour members themselves. In this very illuminating document they mention the more important of the books which have appealed to them and influenced their lives, guiding their thoughts and energies into the channels most congenial to their characters. The more noticeable of these books may be divided into three sections, the first comprising works which belong to general literature, historical, and imaginative; the second comprising works which represent political and social sentiment; the third comprising works which deal with political and social questions scientifically. Those comprised in the first section are classics with all educated readers, such as the Bible, Bunyan, Gibbon, Macaulay, Shakespeare, Pope, Dickens, Scott, and

Lytton. Those comprised in the second section—the section of social and political sentiment—consist almost exclusively of certain works by Carlyle and Ruskin. Of those comprised in the third section—the section of social and political science—a few are the works of extreme socialists, such as Marx; but those which have most readers are the works of Henry George and Mill. Out of the hundred most important books mentioned by forty-three Labour members as influencing them, nearly four-fifths consist, in addition to the Bible, of certain works by the following seven writers, which I give in the order of their popularity. Ruskin, Carlyle, Dickens, Henry George, Scott, J. S. Mill, and Bunyan. Special mention is made of Ruskin by fourteen of the Labour members, of Carlyle by twelve, of Dickens by ten, of Henry George by ten, of Scott by seven, of J. S. Mill by seven, and of Bunyan by six. Special prominence is given to the Bible by ten.

Now, we may pause here to note briefly in passing that none of these writers, to whom the ‘direct’ representatives of labour tell us that they owe so much, no one, with the exception of Bunyan, was in any sense a representative of manual labour himself. Carlyle was the son of a labourer. Dickens perhaps during one period of his youth might have been claimed by the labouring classes as one of their own number. But Dickens and Carlyle became influential and famous by exchanging the activities of labour for activities of another kind. The qualities which have endeared Scott to readers of all classes are distinctively the qualities of the noblest type of country gentleman. Ruskin’s personal or direct connection with labour was limited to his attempts, for a year or so, to break a few stones near Oxford. The moral of all this is—and it is here pointed by the Labour members themselves—that the special kind of activity represented by the labouring classes requires for their own sake to be supplemented by the activities of other classes, numerically small and exerting themselves in a different way.

But the fact to which I mainly desire to call the reader’s attention is one far more precise than this. It is not the fact that the books by which the Labour members have been chiefly influenced are not the books of men who were themselves labourers. It is the fact that of all these books, *no single one has any bearing whatsoever on the practical processes of production*. None gives a single hint available by any human being as to how so much labour, when directed by the productive intellect, may be enabled to produce more than it does at present, or how new openings may be found for it when at present it is involuntarily idle. One of the main objects of the Labour members is to secure for the manual labourer an increasing abundance of the products of the national industry; but how the productivity of this industry is to be increased, how it is to be even maintained, and readapted to constantly changing circumstances—here is a class of questions on which the writers who have influenced the Labour

members do not condescend to touch. And yet for the labourers, more than for any other class, these are the questions which practically underlie everything. The processes by which the few loaves and fishes are to be multiplied must precede all disputes as to the manner in which they are to be dealt out to the multitude.

Let me illustrate this by a case which accords with actual fact. In a town or district in this country, once the seat of the silk industry, the silk mills are gradually closed, and the owners ruined, in consequence of foreign competition. Labour loses what has long been its chief employment, and distress amongst the operatives at last becomes widespread, acute, and notorious. Members of the Labour party, doubtless with the best intentions, visit the neighbourhood, expatiate on the prevalent suffering, preach the doctrine of the minimum wage, the duty of the State to provide work where there is no normal demand for it, and advocate at a series of meetings extending over many months the application of this or that political remedy. Meanwhile a body of men, making no appeals to philanthropy, have been elaborating in private some new species of implement, such as the bicycle or the motor-car, and in consequence of their efforts new industries develop themselves. Bicycle factories and motor-car factories take the place of silk mills, and the means of earning wages become more ample than ever. Which of these sets of men—the representatives of labour, who merely advocate new methods of distributing diminishing products, or the directors of labour, who organise the means by which production is reinvigorated and increased, do most in repairing a catastrophe of the kind in question? It is quite conceivable that there may be room for the efforts of both; but it is evident that the latter do a work far more fundamental than the former. In one part of this country, there are, or were not so many years ago, two adjacent iron-works. The managers of the one were foremost in introducing the Bessemer process. The managers of the other neglected it. The former business has continued to provide employment and subsistence for a growing number of labourers. The employment provided by the latter continued steadily to decline.

What is it primarily that provides bread for a constantly increasing population? It is not the sentiments and aspirations, however beneficent in some ways, that emanate from men influenced by the Carlyles and the Ruskins. It is the brains of men like Bessemer, and of other men who know the value of them. What made the English iron trade that which it is to-day? Not the men who pre-occupy themselves with the ideal claims of labour, but the men whose nights and days were occupied with brooding over the specific methods by which the productivity and the products of labour might be amplified and improved.

It would be an interesting contribution to the history of industrial progress—of the process on which primarily the future of the labouring

class depends—to compare the characters and the faculties of these two industrial types. Whilst one man, resembling the Labour members of to-day (according to their own account of themselves), is occupied with denouncing the wrongs and advancing the claims of labour, the other, like an Arkwright, a Watt, a Bessemer, or an Edison, is occupied with watching the action and powers of steam, or electricity, or the behaviour of metals under this or that treatment, or is meditating on how some by-product, long wasted, may be utilised, on how some commodity, hitherto expensive, may be cheapened, or on how some want, long vaguely felt, may be satisfied by directing labour along hitherto untried courses.

Human nature is complex. The social and industrial process is complex : and in that complex organism, society, there is room for many kinds of effort. As the industrial process of the nation advances, maintains, and readapts itself, circumstances will always arise in which the social interests of labour will require to be reconsidered and safeguarded ; and there will thus always be a place for those who give to the interests of labour their special sympathy and attention. With the increase of wealth, there will also be always an increase in the amount which labour, though it has not produced it, will have the power, and therefore the practical right, to claim. Many of the directors of labour have recognised this, and have been foremost in their endeavours to forward the welfare of those employed by them ; but all classes, whether rich or poor, have, like all bargainers, as all history shows us, a tendency to undue prejudice in favour of their own position. The directors of labour are no exception to this rule ; and there will always be room for representatives through whom labour itself will be able to ventilate and give weight to its own claims. That a certain amount of bitterness should from time to time arise when different classes thus confront each other as bargainers is most probably inevitable. What we may hope for, and work for, is the reduction of this bitterness to a minimum ; and the primary condition essential to this end is that each party should recognise the legitimate position of the other. The directors of labour should not treat labour as a rebel ; nor should labour treat the directors of labour as plunderers.

The only danger, so far as labour is concerned, is that it should overestimate its political powers, not that it should use them. Superficially considered, its powers may seem overwhelming ; but, in the long run, they are not so. They may be so for short periods, but for short periods only ; and, during those short periods, what sort of powers are they ? The powers of multitudes whose sole principle of solidarity consists in the fact that they all work with their hands, are purely obstructive or destructive. The typical weapon of labour as such is the strike ; but no general strike can be more than a passing episode. Men may refuse to work under the direction of this or that employer ; but behind the employer stands the real taskmaster, which is Nature. Sooner or later Nature drives them back to toil ; and meanwhile, if

the strike has been sufficiently widespread and prolonged, there has been a corresponding dislocation of the machinery on which the efficacy of toil depends. Again, another of the typical powers of labour when massed together for purposes of political self-assertion is the direct power of destruction. Any knot of 'loud-mouthed ragamuffins' (as Mr. Keir Hardie calls all of his own class who disagree with him) could wreck the Forth Bridge, burn the British Museum, turn the Elgin Marbles into lime, and all the pictures in the National Gallery into tinder; but not even the animal life of man, still less any rudiment of comfort or civilisation, can be brought into being by labour in the exercise of such a power as this. What politicians of a certain type are always in danger of forgetting is that the destructive or obstructive powers of a mere multitude have nothing whatever to do with any powers that are constructive; and it is through the constructive powers that all men alike live. It is only through constructive powers of the highest and most elaborate kind, unremittingly exercised, that populations enjoy any of the comforts and other advantages of civilisation, or that in thickly populated countries, such as our own, they are able to live at all. To adapt a line of Mr. Kipling's, we may say with profound truth, 'Little they know of labour, who only labour know.'

The only general criticisms of an adverse kind that can be called for by the Labour party as at present constituted, are that its members are too apt to forget the above fundamental fact, and to attribute to labour as such greater powers and importance than it possesses in a complex civilisation such as our own; and farther, that its members, in proportion to the exceptional character of their abilities, fail to represent average labour directly, and represent it only in that indirect way in which it might be represented by any statesmen of equal ability, no matter what their class. The fact, however, remains, that the claims of the labouring classes do require, in a complex society such as ours, not merely as a matter of sentiment, but as a matter of dispassionate statesmanship, a constant and expert attention directed specially to themselves; and that the best way of insuring the nation against demands on the part of labour that are unreasonable, is to satisfy, and if possible to anticipate, those that are just and reasonable. To satisfy or anticipate these may well tax the powers of the most gifted politicians and administrators. The interests of labour, as distinct from the interests of other classes, deserve, on all grounds, the services of such men as these; but labour, as understood and represented by our present Labour members, must learn that it represents only one force out of many, on which the welfare of the poorest, no less than that of the richest, is dependent; and that if its claims exceed that which the underlying facts of society warrant, it will in the long run be worsted by forces which in the long run are greater than its own.

THE KAISER'S DREAMS OF SEA POWER

OLD residents of Portsmouth still remember a boy whom they occasionally saw walking about the dockyard looking at the ships with admiration and rapt attention. His greatest delight seemed to be to watch the great ironclads moving in and out of Spithead. Sometimes he would find his way on board vessels of the Royal Navy. This lad was none other than the German Emperor. As a grandson of Queen Victoria he was a frequent visitor in his boyhood and early manhood to his grandmother during the summer months when she was in residence at Osborne, and on one occasion his father and mother, then the Crown Prince and Princess of Germany, rented Norris Castle, on the outskirts of Cowes, and lived there for several months with their children. Prince William, who was a great favourite of the late Queen, thus became the interested spectator not only of the naval pageants in the Solent directly under the windows of Osborne House and Norris Castle, but watched with interest the gay assemblage in Cowes roadstead for the regatta from year to year. At this time the newly created German Empire had practically no fleet. During the Franco-Prussian war the few ships which flew the flag of the North German Confederation, a striking design of black and white and red which is to-day the emblem of the Kaiser's growing navy, were so weak that they could take little part in the conflict, and France was able to blockade the North Sea coast with impunity. The memory of these recent events was still fresh in the mind of the future Emperor when he visited England and watched the activities of the British navy, with its far-flung squadrons in all the Seven Seas, protecting day by day, not only the Motherland from fear of invasion, but safeguarding all her oversea possessions. He determined that he too would have a great fleet when he succeeded to the throne of the German Empire.

This is no imaginary picture of the ideas which were taking root in the mind of the ruler of the German Empire of to-day. He once confessed that from his earliest youth upwards—'from the day when I ran about as a boy in Portsmouth Dockyard'—he had been greatly interested in British ships. Years afterwards—in fact in

1904—addressing the King, on the occasion of his Majesty's visit to the Kiel Regatta, the Kaiser paid a tribute to the power and traditions of the British navy, with which, he added, he became acquainted as a youth during visits which he paid to England. He recalled that he had had many a sail in the *Dolphin* and *Alberta*, old British royal yachts, and had seen mighty ironclads constructed which had since served their time and disappeared from the Navy List. 'When I came to the throne I attempted to reproduce on a scale commensurate with the resources and interests of my own country, that which had made such a deep impression upon my mind when I saw it as a young man in England.' This is an interesting piece of autobiography, for it is well known that the creation of a German fleet of great power was the Emperor's first ambition when he succeeded his father. Bismarck had realised dimly the meaning of sea power to Germany if she were ever to exercise an influence in world politics, and were to find an outlet for her products and her growing population, but this great statesman did not proceed sufficiently fast to suit the young and impulsive Emperor. Very soon the old and autocratic pilot was dropped and the German Emperor himself took the helm. In less than ten years Wilhelm the Second created a powerful opinion in favour of the construction of an imposing German fleet, and by various cunning devices he succeeded in crystallising the newly created enthusiasm of his people into the greatest naval scheme of this or any previous century.

The German fleet as it will exist less than ten years hence as a war force, probably second only in power to that of Great Britain, will be recognised as the most amazing achievement in statecraft ever accomplished by a single man, for the fleet will be literally the Emperor's personal creation. When he first advocated the construction of a big navy the German people viewed his proposals with indifference and distrust. Shackled by a system of conscription in order to provide the Empire with its huge army, they asked what it would profit them if to the burden of a great army they added the vast expense of a fleet capable not merely of defending their coasts, but of operating on the offensive in distant seas. At first the Kaiser made little progress in educating public opinion, but he still nursed those dreams of sea power which had first taken shape in his mind when he wandered about Portsmouth dockyard and viewed the coming and going of mighty British warships from the grounds of Osborne House. A few years ago he referred with some pride to the persistency with which he had pursued his aims in spite of popular disfavour. At the launch of the *Kaiser Karl der Grosse* he said, 'If the increase in the navy which I demanded with urgent prayers had not been consistently refused me during the first eight years of my reign—I did not even escape derision and mocking at the time—in how different a manner should we now be able to promote our prosperous commerce and our

interests oversea.' He had to wait for many years before he saw his dreams reaching fruition.

As the British Parliament is the mother of all popular representative institutions, so the British navy is the mother of navies. If the records of most of the great fleets of the world are searched it will be found that in greater or less degree they owe their birth to the more or less direct assistance of British naval officers, oftentimes acting with the direct authority of the British Admiralty—while in every fleet in the world even to-day may be found ships designed by British brains and constructed of British material by the skilled craftsmen of these islands. It was to England that Peter the Great came to watch the shipbuilding on the Thames, and it was with a large body of British mechanics that he returned to Russia to create a fleet with which to defend his empire and extend its borders at the point of the gun. The prestige of the Russian navy in the seventeenth century was due entirely to the skill and daring of Scotsmen. The Greigs of four generations, Admiral Elphinstone, Lord Duffus Gordon, and a number of other Scotsmen, entered the service of the Czar and did splendid service, and some of the descendants of these pioneers of the Russian navy may still be traced in the fleet, while at Barrow-in-Furness even to-day a mighty cruiser for the Tzar's new fleet is under construction. The American navy was, of course, of distinctly British origin; so were the fleets of many of the South American republics; while, as everyone knows, the seeds of the sea power of Japan were sown by British naval officers, including, first and foremost, Admiral Sir Archibald Douglas, and the excellence to which the Chinese navy once attained was also due to British instruction under a Scotsman, Admiral Lang.

In the case of the modern German fleet the British Admiralty had little part in its upbuilding, but British naval power fired the imagination of the Kaiser, and it was a kindly present made years ago by King William the Fourth to the then King of Prussia, which first directed the Kaiser's thoughts towards the sea. When the present Emperor was a boy one of his favourite recreations was to sail a beautiful model of a British frigate on the lake at Potsdam. This little ship, of excellent workmanship, was sent as a present to the then ruler of Prussia early in the last century by our sailor King, and was a never-failing source of pleasure to the present German Emperor as a youth. From his earliest years at home and in England the future ruler's aspirations were always toward the sea, and we can now see that his dreams of later years, which have taken such tangible shape, were largely due to those vivid impressions of sea power which he obtained during his visits to England, and which reached their climax in 1889 when Queen Victoria, on the occasion of his visit to the Cowes Regatta, conferred on him the unique rank of Admiral of the Fleet.

Though other foreign princes and monarchs have since been made honorary officers of the British navy, the German Emperor remains

to-day the only officer holding supreme rank. The commission conferred upon the Kaiser was purely honorary, but his Majesty has never concealed the pride with which he dons the British uniform with its deep gold cuffs and cocked hat, and he can boast that he is the only ruler of a foreign state who has ever commanded the British navy in modern times.

Great Britain has always boasted of her 'splendid isolation,' and the German Emperor's is the only alien hand which has controlled any of her fleets. In times gone by a British squadron was placed under the orders of Peter the Great. This incident occurred during the Czar's operations against Sweden, when he received the assistance of a squadron from these islands and hoisted his flag in command of the allied forces. In after years he admitted that this was the proudest day in his life. Between this date and the year when the German Emperor became an Admiral of the Fleet the British navy maintained its absolute independence. But soon after the Emperor received the honorary rank from Queen Victoria he seized the opportunity to emulate the example of Peter the Great, and he afterwards confessed in a speech he delivered on board the British battleship, *Royal Sovereign*, that the incident had left an indelible impression upon his mind. 'One of the best days of my life,' he remarked, 'which I shall never forget as long as I live, was the day when I inspected the Mediterranean Fleet when I was on board the *Dreadnought*, and my flag was hoisted for the first time.' The Kaiser at this time was making a cruise in the Mediterranean and visited Athens to attend the wedding of his sister to the Crown Prince of Greece. Sir Anthony Hoskins, who was then only a vice-admiral, was in command of the British fleet which had assembled in honour of the royal marriage. The German Emperor decided that in his new role as a British officer he would exercise command, and consequently the emblem of an Admiral of the Fleet, which consists of the Union flag, was broken at the main on board the old battleship *Dreadnought*, of which the present Vice-Admiral Alington was captain. Sir Anthony Hoskins, being a junior officer, was forthwith relieved of the control of the British men-of-war, and nominally, though not of course actually, the German Emperor, during the time that his flag was flown, was in command of the greatest of all the fighting squadrons of the British Empire.

On a subsequent occasion, at Malta, his Majesty again visited the British fleet. Arriving at this great naval base, he announced that on the following day he would inspect one of the men-of-war. Accordingly, he proceeded on board and his flag was forthwith hoisted. It was thought that his Majesty would formally walk round the decks and then take some light refreshments and return to his yacht. This was not the case, however. No sooner did the Emperor reach the quarterdeck, where he was received with naval honours by all the

officers, than he took off his coat and intimated that he was ready to go over the ship. His Majesty went everywhere, from the turrets to the engine and boiler rooms, and kept the captain fully occupied answering a multitude of questions as to the design and equipment of the vessel. With all the impetuosity of his nature, he dived into every hole and corner and saw everything, and the captain was kept so busy that he forgot his duty as host and the wines which he had laid in for the occasion. At last the inspection ended, and the questions ceased, and his Majesty prepared, after complimenting the captain on the smartness of his ship, to go down the companion ladder to his launch. As he did so, he turned to the captain and said, 'Yours must be the longest ship in the British navy.' 'I think not, your Majesty,' replied the captain, 'it's only 420 feet long.' 'Oh! you surely are mistaken,' added the Emperor, and then the captain remembered the naval slang as to 'long-ships in the navy,' namely, those with long intervals between refreshments. He forthwith apologised profusely for the oversight and implored the Emperor to return to the cabin. His Majesty would not however do so, but added, 'January 27 is my birthday, and my orders are that on that day you entertain all your brother captains to dinner and drink my health.' He then left, pleased at the result of the incident.

When the day arrived the dinner was duly held, and the guests enjoyed themselves immensely. During the evening they despatched the following message to the Emperor: 'The orders of our Admiral of the Fleet have been carried out, and we have drunk your Majesty's good health. But there is one point on which we cannot agree with your Majesty, and that is as to H.M.S. — being a long ship.' From this the Emperor, who is familiar with the language of the navy, was able to infer that on that occasion there had been no lack of hospitality.

On many occasions the Emperor has visited the British men-of-war in virtue of his commission as Admiral of the Fleet, and no visitor has been more welcome to the officers of the fleet. His Majesty has always been very popular in the navy, and by many little incidents, typical of a ruler who has much of the sailor's roving nature and love of good fellowship, he has endeared himself to the men of the British fleet. More than once, when yachting in Norwegian waters, he has fallen in with a cadets' training-ship and entertained the future officers in the most delightful manner, throwing aside all the aloofness which had made his young guests anticipate the meeting with some amount of dread. During his succession of summer visits to Cowes Regatta in the early years of his reign, he never lost an opportunity of further cementing the ties of friendship with the British Service, and after his accession he took an early opportunity of bringing his fleet to Spithead that Queen Victoria might see the vessels.

There can be little doubt that the German Emperor believed and hoped that he could create his great fleet without arousing the jealousy

of the people of Great Britain. From the very first he made no secret of his ambition, either in this country or in Germany, and for a time it seemed likely that he would succeed. English people, pleased at his admission that he intended to mould his fleet on the British model, viewed his aspirations with a certain amount of sympathy, but this was probably due rather to ignorance of the ultimate object in view than to benevolence. It was not until affairs in South Africa began to approach a crisis in 1896 that attention was devoted to the German Emperor's propaganda. At the time of the Jameson Raid his Majesty sent a telegram of sympathy to the late President Kruger which at once roused the British people, and a special service squadron was immediately fitted out at Spithead. The Emperor has repeatedly asserted that he had no unfriendly motive in thus congratulating the Government of the Transvaal, because he believed that the raid was a mere 'rash act of revolutionaries,' but this telegram and the equipment of a powerful squadron amid all the excitement of possible war, intentionally or unintentionally, served as the lever by which the German people were at last won over to an admission that the German Empire needed a fleet more considerable in size and power than the collection of coast defence ships which it then possessed.

Curiously enough this untoward incident, which marked the severance of the friendly ties which had bound the two peoples together, was preceded by the great naval demonstration at Kiel in celebration of the opening of the Kaiser Wilhelm canal. This waterway had been constructed at great outlay so as to enable ships to pass from the Baltic to the North Sea in a period of ten hours, instead of making the long and more or less dangerous passage around the Belt. All the fleets of the world assembled in honour of this event, and Great Britain sent a squadron of four battleships, three cruisers, and a torpedo gunboat, while Italy sent a squadron as large. No less than fourteen different countries were represented by ships of war, and the gathering was the most wonderful assemblage of men-of-war that the world had ever seen. At this time the German Emperor had been reading with great care and annotating Captain Mahan's striking works on sea power, and by calling together the warships of the world within Kiel Harbour his Majesty conveyed to the German people an impression of the weakness of the German fleet which could have been driven home in no other way. They realised then that even the great continental Powers which boasted of millions of armed men ashore were concentrating attention on the up-building of their might afloat, and when in the following year the British Government fitted out on the spur of the moment a special squadron in reply to the Jameson Raid telegram, they had an object lesson which quickly bore fruit.

In 1898 an Act was passed by the Reichstag for greatly strengthening the German navy. The provision, great as it was, did not by any

means satisfy the aspirations of the German Emperor, but history was conspiring on his side. In 1899 the South African war occurred, and immediately complications with Germany became inevitable owing to the action of German merchants in supplying the Boers with war material. The trading class in Germany realised that owing to the weakness of the German fleet their Government could do little to keep open this profitable avenue of commerce. Once more the realisation of the meaning of sea power was prominently presented to the German people, and they were reminded that while Russia was tacitly permitted by Great Britain to continue her silent but victorious progress in the Far East owing to deep-rooted belief in her naval power, Germany, possessing only a small navy, hardly counted in world politics. The opportunity thus occurred for further expanding the plans for creating a powerful German navy, and it was seized without delay. In the spring following the outbreak of the war in South Africa, the naval plans passed as recently as 1898 were further expanded into a great programme spreading over a period of years.¹

The event was marked by the Emperor by another famous telegram, this time to the directors of the North German Steamship Company, in which he stated, 'We shall be able to impose peace on sea as well as on land.' In addressing his generals his Majesty declared, 'As my grandfather did for the army, so will I for the navy carry out the work of reorganisation.' The German Navy Act of 1900, though in detail it suffered at the hand of the Reichstag, was the embodiment of the German Emperor's dreams which as a boy had come to him in the British naval arsenal, and he lost no opportunity of reminding the German people of the influence which a great fleet would have upon the future destinies of the German Empire. A few days after his speech to his generals some German ships were seized by British cruisers off Delagoa Bay on suspicion of carrying arms and stores to the Boers. The incident aroused great popular feeling against England throughout Germany, and the Emperor sent another famous telegram, on this occasion to the King of Wurtemberg, expressing his hope that 'the events of the last few days have convinced wider and wider circles that Germany's honour, as well as her interests, must be protected on distant seas, and for this purpose Germany must be strong and mighty on sea as well as on land.' While his Majesty obtained his first ideas of the meaning of sea power from the men-of-war he saw coming and going at Spithead, his ideas were crystallised by the teaching of Mahan, and were intentionally or otherwise carried to fruition with the assistance of a long series of telegrams which will probably rank as among the most

¹ By 1917 the German fleet will comprise 38 battleships (including 18 equivalent to the British *Dreadnought*), 20 large armoured cruisers, 38 scouting cruisers, and 144 torpedo boats.

momentous in their effect of all the millions which have flashed over the wire by electricity.

While these messages had an important influence upon public opinion, the German Emperor realised that something more than sporadic object lessons was essential and he decided to embark upon a widespread propaganda. His Majesty set machinery in motion which resulted in the creation of the German Navy League, and at his suggestion his younger brother, Admiral Prince Henry of Prussia, who is about to become Commander-in-Chief of the whole Active Fleet of the German Empire, became its patron. Probably no organisation has had a more conspicuously successful career or exerted a more powerful influence upon popular opinion in any country. Its organisation was typically German, and unquestionably efficient. It proceeded to found branches in all parts of the Empire, and as it had the Emperor's brother at its head, and was known to have been created as a vehicle for circulating widely the Emperor's views as to the need of a national awakening to the meaning of sea power, its membership came to be regarded as a badge of loyalty and co-operation in its affairs as a mark of distinction. It spread its tentacles into the smallest village of Germany, and within a few years it could boast of a membership exceeding half a million, with an income of upwards of 30,000*l*. From year to year it has pursued its propaganda with unflinching persistency, and no sooner was the Naval Act of 1900 passed than it began an agitation for further expansion. Unfortunately for the good relationship of the German and English peoples it did not hesitate to assist the movement by creating feelings of mistrust and jealousy against Great Britain. This aspect of the agitation became very prominent, and last year led to repeated protests in the Reichstag. But an organisation founded as this had been without the direct encouragement of the Chancellor could, of course, escape official interference until such time as the Emperor might think it wise to intervene. Whatever the influence of the movement may have been in exciting feelings of jealousy against the British people, at one time by exaggerating the strength of the British fleet in contrast with that of Germany, and at another by holding up to German eyes the widespread British Colonies as palpable fruits of sea power, there can be no doubt that the Navy League has succeeded in bringing the majority of the German people into line with their Emperor on the importance of a great German fleet.

In addition to the Navy League the Emperor also worked openly to encourage naval sentiment in a very practical way. To the members of the Reichstag he lectured on one occasion for two hours on the future of the German fleet, illustrating his remarks by diagrams drawn by himself, and at other times he has sent to the Reichstag carefully prepared statements of the strength of the great fleets in contrast with the weakness of the German navy, and more than once he has

given his views on questions of naval construction. Indeed, in his *role* as the creator of the new German navy, his Majesty became a naval constructor whose views had great influence in fixing the designs of German men-of-war. Sir Edward Reed, a former Director of British Naval Construction, once remarked that he very much doubted if any other Admiral of the Fleet in the British naval service would have shown himself so thoroughly well informed concerning the most trivial detail of a ship or its machinery 'as the head of the German navy.'

One of the most successful efforts of the Emperor in creating a naval atmosphere was his attempt to make Kiel the great yachting centre of the world. Already, so well have his plans developed, this annual regatta overshadows Cowes in importance; and year by year the German people are taking increasing interest in this sport. It has become one of the most fashionable pursuits of the wealthy, and the sentiment of the sea is thus spreading from the Emperor downward. His activity has also taken another very practical direction. Since he ascended the throne his Majesty has let no opportunity slip of encouraging the great German shipping companies. The time was when the British flag was supreme on the Atlantic, but to-day the swiftest ocean greyhounds bear the German commercial flag. By means of State assistance in one form or another the blue ribbon of the Atlantic has been seized from the great British lines, and this achievement has powerfully assisted the Emperor in his agitation for a strong fleet.

When he began his reign the German people believed that British supremacy on the seas was unassailable. In every part of the world British men-of-war were patrolling, protecting British interests, and the best ships of the Atlantic sailed from British ports. With all the enthusiasm of a fanatic, the German Emperor has disabused his people of this early belief, and year by year opportunities have occurred for driving home the truth of his famous declaration, 'Our future lies on the sea.' Since he grasped the reins of government he has spent his holidays cruising—though he suffers from *mal de mer* when the waves are contrary—and wherever the royal yacht *Hohenzollern* has ploughed its furrow the Kaiser has found some means of concentrating the eyes of the world on his fleet, and thus ministering to the pride of his people.

ARCHIBALD S. HURD.

THE CRY OF 'WOLF!'

TRANSFERRED from New York to London one finds himself at once in a new atmosphere. In the former, as a citizen of a continent under one flag, with no enemies to fear, the exciting incidents of life are domestic. He is concerned only with internal affairs. What takes place in other parts of the world, with rare exceptions, is to him matter of curiosity rather than importance.

Reading the newspapers in London for a day, all is changed. He realises that he is again in the old Island Home, unfortunately 'engulfed in the vortex of militarism,' to use Sir Wilfrid Laurier's phrase. Telegrams from European capitals bear directly upon the aspirations and generally the hostile intentions of the various rival countries of Europe. Germany in the Morocco dispute, the designs of Turkey upon Tabah Harbour, Russia's designs upon India, Germany's unquenchable ambition to rival Britain on the sea—these or subjects of similar import are laid before the Briton day after day, and sinister interpretations generally given to ordinary routine events.

The furthest of European capitals is nearer to London than cities from which the American gathers the daily news of his own country, but although the field of his interest equals the whole of Europe, there is nothing to arouse suspicion or jealousy, the issues arising being home questions. In the old home, on the contrary, the cry of 'Wolf!' is rarely absent. There is usually some real or imaginary danger menacing it from some quarter, calling for increased armaments on sea and conscription on land. This is in some degree inevitable, for Europe being an armed camp with millions of men trained and ready to attack or repel the attack of each other, the cry of 'Wolf!' is ready to burst forth at every rustling leaf in the forest. All Europe sleeps in fear, and hears the wolf in terrible dreams which afflict her nightly, and this although the past shows that a generation of alarms may all be false.

There are occasions no doubt, though rare, when reason for apprehension may arise, but there seem to the writer to be two pure delusions which especially afflict Britain. One is the cry of 'Russian wolf!' When an increased army is demanded it is against this it is said to be needed. In Mr. Balfour's weighty speech upon British defence

this stands in the foreground. A great reserve army must be held in Britain, prepared, capable, and ready, to reinforce the army in India when the Russian wolf appears. How the fear of Russian attacks upon India arose it is difficult to understand. It is true that she has annexed coterminous territory, but never yet have we been able to obtain from any source a reasonable explanation why Russia should desire or why she would take, if offered, such a burden as control of India. Unlike the other regions annexed by her, India is to-day already fully populated, if not over-populated. There is no room there for Russians any more than for Britons to settle, and if there were, the climate, fatal to British, would be equally so to Russian occupation. Britain obtains no decided advantage from India, which trades freely with all nations. It cannot be made to yield revenue to any foreign occupant without sapping allegiance. Its occupation can only be a drain upon the military power of the occupant, as it is admittedly the chief drain upon that of Britain. It is not in the nature of things that seventy or eighty thousand foreign troops can hold control of three hundred millions of people when these become intelligent, as the people of India are fast becoming through British schools. Were Britain free from India to-day it would be unwise in her to take possession if that were offered, because it can never be colonised. It must be held by force, and hence remain foreign to the conquering nation, union being impossible. These considerations are not likely to be overlooked by Russia, even if she may 'demonstrate' now and then, in the tortuous throes of European politics, as if she seriously had intentions of menacing British power in India. It would not be good sense for Russia to add India to her responsibilities even if gifted to her. But assuming for a moment that Russia could commit the fatuous folly of invading India, there would still be the people of India to be reckoned with. The writer travelled through India and was introduced to educated natives by American officials, who, without exception, were upon terms of closest intimacy with the people. To the Briton, his master, the Indian is naturally reserved; to the American he is drawn by sympathetic bonds. Conversation was quite free and unrestrained, and the writer believes that he thus obtained an insight into the situation in India which few Britons can secure. That there is a strong and growing desire on the part of educated Indians ultimately to govern their own country goes without saying. They would not be educated if this aspiration did not arise within them. Education makes rebels against invaders. Material benefits conferred by them, however great, count for little against the spirit of national independence. As we write we hear of unrest even in Egypt, where the invaders' rule has been exceptionally fruitful. The slaveholders in America were quite justified in putting to death under the law any man who taught their slaves to read, if we concede their right to continue the system of slavery, for it is

obviously necessary that slaves be kept in ignorance. The British policy in India has been grandly different. The young Indians are educated in British colleges and schools, and read British history. They know the long and glorious struggle of the people against absolute monarchs. Their heroes are the heroes of our English-speaking race. They have the story of Washington and the American Revolution, and what is even more significant, they have taken deeply to heart the support which some of the foremost statesmen and many of the people of Britain gave to the Americans fighting "for British liberties." British history cannot be read and understood without inspiring within the studious reader under military control an invincible resolve to free and govern his own country.

Following Indian affairs with interest, the writer judges that within recent years this sentiment has grown rapidly and is continually strengthening. The native Press proves this. Let there, then, be no delusion about the Indian problem. The aim of the educated there to-day is to govern their own country some day, and this sentiment must soon permeate the others, but notwithstanding this the writer can bear testimony to one important fact, highly creditable to British rule: not one Indian ever spoke upon the subject who did not express decided preference for British supervision over that of any other Power. The safety of Britain lies in this, and if the issue ever were made, which is highly improbable, indeed almost impossible to assume, of Britain *versus* Russia, or Britain *versus* Germany, or Britain *versus* any other Power or combination of Powers, there would not be two parties, but one solid people determined to support Britain. It says much for Britain that after nearly two centuries of control this preference exists. No other people are to be compared with the British as rulers of others, and foremost of all their qualities is that they execute righteous judgment. The people of India appreciate this.

Russia, or any other Power or combination of Powers, invading India, therefore, would have to reckon not only with the military forces of Britain, but with the power of the whole people of India behind them. It is not Russia, nor any nation of Europe, nor all the nations combined that Britain has to fear in such a contest, for no nation but Britain could have done for India and her people what she has done. The people of India know this well.

If India be properly guided, therefore, no violent revolution need be feared. The movement toward independence would be orderly and slow, although irresistible. We can imagine India deciding to set up for herself, as we can imagine Canada or Australasia, as the daughter, leaving the mother's house to establish a home for herself, followed by the love of the mother, fully reciprocated by the daughter. The true policy of Britain, in the opinion of the writer, is to say some day soon to India, as she has said to Canada and Australasia, that if she ever feels the time has arrived when she must establish government

for herself, so be it. Not a hand will be raised against her; she will go with the mother's blessing. It is because this has been said to the British self-governing Colonies that they remain loyal Colonies to-day. Proclaim coercion and the part of America would soon be played by them over again. When India is told this, the effect will be as it has been with the Colonies—viz. to bind her closer and to keep her longer than otherwise within the Empire.

As far as the military and other British authorities in India are concerned, their advice as to policy is generally worse than worthless—it is misleading. Constant contact with a danger feared renders sound judgment upon it impossible. They are as men sitting upon the safety-valve with the escaping steam roaring in their ears and who advise putting additional pressure upon the valve to keep it down, which would be disastrous. Force here is no remedy. Safety lies in letting it escape more freely; less, not more, pressure is the only policy. Lord Kitchener's activity in strengthening the British military position in India so ostentatiously is in the wrong direction. True, Russia is proclaimed the ostensible enemy feared, but the intelligent people of India know better. If all were known, it is not Russian or any foreign attack that the military officials dread. It is the growing home-rule sentiment they consider dangerous to British control. It is against the people of India, not against the foreigner, that the legions are to be moved. It would be a fatal mistake for Britain to ignore the truth that intelligent natives take keenly to heart and brood over the fact that no native regiment is entrusted with artillery. The people of India fully recognise the significance of this. It invites serious thought as revealing mistrust. As long as it exists it will tell the story of foreign subjection, military occupation, a just conqueror, yet a conqueror and all that this implies. There is no Russian wolf or any other that can find desirable prey there, or which could capture it from the people of India if there were. The British army needs no strengthening to meet this imaginary Russian danger, neither to meet the danger of intensified native dissatisfaction, for the sure and only effective cure for that is to begin at once an enlargement of native participation in the government, holding out the promise that Britain is teaching them to become self-governing in due time. The problem is internal, not external. It is within, not without, India that the wolf lurks. So much for India and delusion number one.

There is a second British delusion, in the opinion of the writer, as wild as the first and equally baseless: Germany as a rival to Britain upon the sea. The fear of German rivalry is well grounded, but it is on the land, not on the water. Her industrial development is a great fact in the world's history, which cannot fail to attract attention. She is already a great Empire, and rapidly growing greater. The 121,000 square miles of Britain cannot hope to support more than

three-fifths of the people the 209,000 square miles of Germany can and will soon maintain. It cannot hope to produce as much iron and steel, nor to continue to increase its percentage of shipping, as rapidly as Germany. Although adding much more yearly, the percentage of increase of Germany must be greater, since she has comparatively so little shipping in the aggregate; but because Germany has increased and is to increase, it does not follow that Britain has decreased or will decrease thereby in either department. It simply means that two-thirds more territory will ultimately support two-thirds more people, and the people will produce so much more. Nothing that Britain can do will prevent this. It is highly probable that it is the progress of Germany as an industrial Power which has aroused the unreasonable jealousy of her as a naval, shipping, and colonial Power, which, as far as we can see, is baseless.

This 'wolf' cry shares the exaggerations of Dame Rumour with her thousand tongues. Germany's alleged ambitions which alarm the timid, when compared with the means she has of accomplishing these alleged stupendous designs, are rendered positively chimerical. The supposed would-be mistress of the seas has a naval tonnage less than that of America, and according to the latest figures she has only twenty-four battleships against Britain's fifty-five, tonnage 204,581 against 732,480, more than three to one. The *Statesman's Year Book*, 1904, gives four armoured cruisers against twenty, thirty-nine protected cruisers against fifty-four, forty-seven destroyers against one hundred and thirty, one submarine against ten. No one ever questions the efficiency of the British navy. Ship for ship, it compares favourably, to say the least, with that of any other Power. So say the naval officers of other countries. This because, unlike the army, the British navy is a profession. Britain's shipping compared with Germany's is as ten and a half to two and a third million tons (1904), say nearly five to one.

The German 'wolf' in both naval and shipping form is a very small one to make so great a cry. Only those who measure it can realise how groundless the alarm is.

It must clearly be only in union with another navy that the German navy can be seriously considered. Surely the most timid Briton can sleep soundly without fear of the French navy ever being so utilised, but even if it were, the two combined would still be inferior to that of Britain. So would it be were the Italian and the Austro-Hungarian combined with it. There formerly remained the Russian navy, but the question of Russian naval support is relegated to the future. What possible combination is there, then, that should alarm the Briton? There cannot be one who imagines that America could be induced to become the ally of Germany or of any European Power, or combination of Powers, against the old home. No one can even imagine the issue upon which such a combination could be based.

On the contrary, if the invasion of Britain were ever imminent, a wild supposition, in all probability America would be found at her side. The Briton disturbed about what the German navy might do in combination with any possible ally imagines vain things.

The truth is that the naval disablement of Russia has thrown the programme adopted for increasing the British navy out of all proportion. We read of no less than eight battleships under construction. The increase of French and German navies is comparatively trifling in comparison. The Liberal Government, searching for a field for necessary reduction of expenditure, has it at hand in the navy. With a capacity for producing warships not less than that of Europe combined, Britain can safely follow America in deciding this year to build none, and at most one battleship per year hereafter for years to come ; even this one may be found unnecessary.

It is in order to-day in Britain to exclaim against the increase of armaments and demand an agreement of the Powers to cease increasing. Each nation insists that it is compelled to increase its warships because others do. The real culprit, therefore, is the nation that leads the way. Britain has just launched a larger and more powerful ship than any hitherto known. Here she takes the lead. Germany, if we are to trust newspapers, has determined to build one to match the *Dreadnought*, and President Roosevelt has asked the American Congress to do so. The blame of enlargement is here solely upon Britain. No such monsters as proposed would have been built by either Germany or America if Britain had not challenged them. A second British battleship was launched the other day, the *Agamemnon*, said to be the greatest of all. Here is another challenge. The guilty one is he who sets the pace. The House passed the President's request for the one battleship to equal the *Dreadnought*. He had previously stated that America has now a navy large enough, and her policy hereafter is only to keep the present navy efficient, for which one battleship a year is sufficient. No increase in ships is desired. One hundred and thirty-five votes in Congress were cast against building even the one monster asked for to maintain the efficiency of the present fleet, but it obtained a small majority. In the Senate, however, under the guidance of one of the wisest men in public life in America, Senator Hale, Chairman of the Naval Committee, it was resolved not to pass the Bill for the new ship until the complete plans thereof had been laid before the Committee and approved. This postpones the Bill for a year at least. The writer does not believe the President is at all grieved at the delay. Such is public sentiment in the Republic to-day upon naval expansion, and such the Government policy as announced by President Roosevelt. Here is an example which should not be lost upon Britain. If Britain, as the leading naval Power, were to call the attention of France and Germany to the declared policy of America, and intimate a willingness to join them in following America's

example, much might be accomplished. If not, the Liberal peaceful party of Britain would have at least done what might be expected of it. It would be greatly to its credit that it had offered to co-operate with the Republic, thus throwing the united voice of the English-speaking race in favour of ceasing to increase the number or power of warships for mutual destruction.

There is another alleged source of apprehension in regard to Germany—her ambition to become a great Colonial Empire. The German Emperor is truly a great ruler. He has infused his patriotic fervor throughout the Empire and has become a commanding figure in the world, no titular sovereign but the real leader of his people. Ambitious for Germany undoubtedly. Why not? He is to be extolled for his intense devotion to his country, as King Edward is for his, but he is also credited, we believe justly, with great good sense: ambitious if you please, but still guided, let us say, by some degrees of judgment. He must know that the one great failure of Germany so far is her colonial possessions.

Germany's colonial policy is of very recent growth. It began in 1884. Tongoland, 33,000 square miles, population (1904) one million and a half, has on'y 189 Europeans, 179 of these Germans. Kamerun, 191,000 square miles, a half larger than the United Kingdom, has only 710 whites, of whom 638 are Germans. German South-west Africa, 322,450 square miles, much larger than the German Empire, has 200,000 belonging to Hottentot, Bushman, Bantu and Damara races; Europeans only 4,682; number of Germans not given; the garrison 606 officers and men. Kiau-Chau Bay has a population of 1,200,000, whites only 3,735, number of Germans not given. German East Africa has 384,000 square miles, population 6,700,000, mostly mixed tribes of Bantu race; European population only 1,437, of whom 1,102 are Germans. Marshall Islands, twenty-four in number, population 5,000; Europeans only eighty-one, of whom Germans sixty-one. Bismarck Archipelago has only 203 Germans. In the whole German Colonial Empire there are not twenty thousand white people, certainly not fifteen thousand Germans.

The total trade of Germany in 1903 with her Colonial Empire was :

Imports to Germany, 376,750*l*.

Exports to Colonies, 1,221,300*l*.

Britain's trade with the Channel Islands exceeds this. An enemy of Germany might well wish her more colonies. Britain could do worse than offer her a gift of more than one extensive area she has rashly taken under her wing in recent years, which can never be the home of Britons, nor anything but a source of loss and anxiety.

It is clear that Germany is incapable of becoming a colonising Power. First, she has not the great surplus population needed. Fortunately, there is work in Germany for her increase, thanks to her Emperor in

good measure, whose attention to and sense in business affairs are remarkable. Second, of her small surplus 96 per cent. go to America, mostly to relatives and friends already there who have sent for them because profitable work awaits. This startling fact should never be overlooked. Third, assuming that the German Emperor and his advisers have only average good sense, yet they must see that her emigration, such as that upon a vast scale to America, or in less volume to Southern Brazil, or even upon the smallest scale, inevitably results in the German emigrant becoming a citizen of the country he settles in, and a peaceable, industrious, and loyal citizen he is. This is so even with the emigrant himself, who generally becomes naturalised, while his children born abroad are loyal citizens of their native land. Little trace of the German remains; they are soon merged in the prevailing type and lost to Germany.

Germany's present settlements in Africa and China can never be colonies, but only stations held by garrisons involving more expense than there can be return, and what must be more disappointing, the German element must remain a foreign element as the British is in India. Neither Germany nor any other Power can ever create an America or Canada or Australasia as Britain has, and which have made her the only possible 'Mother of Nations,' since her emigrants remain of the race. She stands and must stand alone in this sublime office.

That a Colonial Empire can be founded hereafter that will add to the strength of the European founder is a delusion. South America is closed. Europeans cannot colonise in the Far East or in India. They must ever remain a permanent invader, among but not of the native people. There is not a known region to-day in the world open to colonisation worth possessing which can be colonised by Europeans and become part of the parent European Empire.

We have had, even in America, faint echoes of the 'wolf' cry of German Colonisation in South America with resultant danger to the Monroe Doctrine. The able German Ambassador in Washington, Baron von Sternberg, has recently banished these for ever. We commend this subject to the attention of those timid Britons who hear and even see the German wolf of Colonial Empire in their disordered dreams. The story is soon told. Emigration from the whole German Empire is not as great as that from Ireland, small as that now is. In 1900 it was only 22,000; 1901, 32,000; 1902, 36,000; 1903, 38,000; 1904, 27,924.

South America began to attract Germans about ninety years ago, when Brazil received its first German immigrants. To-day there are about two hundred thousand of German extraction, descendants of these immigrants, in its southern parts. These are now loyal Brazilians and excellent citizens lost to Germany. The Argentine Republic has attracted very few Germans. Out of a total of 2,279,000 immigrants

between 1857 and 1895, there were only 25,000 Germans, but many of these are prominent citizens, all loyal to the core to the Republic, as the Germans in America are to her. Here is the point to be noted by European empire-builders, 'the offspring of the early settlers in South America have almost invariably renounced or lost their German citizenship and have embraced the citizenship of their adopted country. They have not the remotest thought of returning to their former homes.' Such is the statement of the German Ambassador referred to.

In the published official news of the German Government upon emigration, we read, 'Emigration in the eyes of the law is an economic phase of the social life of the Nation which in itself is an economic loss to the Commonwealth. It should not receive Government aid regardless of the country of its final destination.'

German emigration from 1871, the year of the unification of the Empire, up to 1894, was and still is almost wholly to America. Out of a total of 2,616,731, no less than 2,399,803 went there. In 1904, 26,085 went to America out of a total of 27,984. No trace of additional power has this added to Germany. On the contrary, it is all her loss and all America's gain. Germans cease to be German and become naturalised Americans.

To show to what lengths baseless fears can lead their victims when this cry of 'Wolf!' is raised, we give the figures of German emigration to America, Brazil, and all other South American countries for the past seven years:

Number of Emigrants in recent years to—					
		United States.	Brazil.	All other S.A. States.	Total.
1898	.	18,563	821	1,139	22,221
1899	.	19,806	896	997	22,323
1900	.	19,703	864	530	22,309
1901	.	19,912	402	271	22,073
1902	.	29,211	807	263	32,098
1903	.	33,649	693	252	36,310
1904	.	26,085	355	316	27,984

Let us repeat, Germany, fortunately for herself, has not surplus people to colonise any part of the world. What she has got to America to friends, about twenty to thirty thousand a year, and only a few scattering hundreds to other countries.

So fades into nothingness the phantom of German colonisation in South America and Africa or anywhere else. It will surely be impossible to raise the colonial 'wolf cry' again in face of this complete exposure of the non-existence even of the wolf's shadow.

From the race point of view, our English-speaking race is the only important gainer by emigration, which flows almost wholly to America. One and a quarter million emigrants are expected this

year, and probably a hundred thousand in Canada. The flow elsewhere consists only of a few thousands here and there, scarcely worth considering. What this means may be inferred from there being already in America, according to the 1900 census, twenty-six millions of German descent, merged or steadily merging in the dominant American English-speaking type, all traces of German origin rapidly fading away. So with other lands. All lose their emigrants. Britain only transplants hers, hence the certain supremacy of the English-speaking race at no distant date, because it is not only keeping its own increase, but absorbing the emigrants of other races as well.

Meanwhile the Briton who dreads either Russian 'wolf' in India or elsewhere, or the German 'wolf' on Sea, or in Colonial Empire, or in Shipping, is the victim of imaginary fears. No danger is to be apprehended from either, even if his navy were much less powerful and his army were considerably reduced.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

Skibo Castle : June 10, 1906.

MALAISE OF THE MONEY MARKET

'A good banker will have accumulated in ordinary times the reserve that he is to make use of in extraordinary times.'—BAGEHOT's *Lombard Street*.

YEAR after year for some years past the position in Lombard Street has become less satisfactory instead of more satisfactory, and we want to ascertain whether this unfavourable tendency is of a transitory or of a permanent character.

In December last the Bank of England's reserve¹ of notes and coin fell below 18,000,000*l.*, and again, a couple of months ago (on the 10th of May), below 21,000,000*l.* These figures touched 'the apprehension limit,' which may now be regarded as about 20,000,000*l.*, and from this point of view it is worth while to consider carefully some speeches delivered at a bankers' dinner in London on the 9th of May last, when Lord Faber, the chairman of the dinner, and the President of the English County Bankers' Association, deliberately declared that

London and the country were suffering from what, in bankers' circles, was called 'a gold famine.' They wanted gold very badly indeed; and if by any chance the half-million a week which was now coming to London from South Africa were stopped, he ventured to say that those present would agree with him that a very serious state of things might arise to the commerce of the country.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose speech followed, said in regard to the gold reserve: 'The whole of this question was, he thought, a matter of grave and increasing importance, and it was at that moment engaging his most serious attention.'

And the Governor of the Union Bank of London concluded by saying 'That it was a serious question, and deserved the attention not only of the Governor and Directors of the Bank of England, but of all bankers.' It may be added that the Governor of the Bank of England was present, although he is not reported as having taken any part in the discussion.

Here we have competent authorities on the special subject of bank reserves addressing a competent audience, representing nearly 800,000,000*l.* of deposits payable on demand, and there was not a

¹ I refer here to the Bank of England's *reserve*, and later in the article I refer only to the Bank's holding of bullion.

single dissentient voice reported amongst them. It was an occasion when the speakers must have been impressed with the responsibility of their utterances. Men facing such liabilities always want to make the best of things, not the worst, and the outside public, after making reasonable allowance for a possibly rhetorical exaggeration in the use of the word 'famine,' will naturally want to know the reason of the present scarcity, considering that the world's production of gold during the last fifteen years has been on an unprecedented scale—about 700,000,000*l.*, nearly one-half of the total production in the hundred years between 1801–1900.

My intention in this little paper is to endeavour to throw some light on the question by a comparison; and we may take 1873 as a starting-point of our comparison, because the interval that has elapsed since then gives a broad field of view for calmly and deliberately observing certain tendencies at work, and because it was the year in which Mr. Bagehot published his book on Lombard Street, a book that has probably been more widely read than any other book on a purely financial subject. It is a brilliant little volume, and the object of the author was not only to give a vivid account of the working of the London money market, but he also desired to awaken us to certain risks incident to our peculiar system of banking. To use his own words: 'I shall have failed in my purpose if I have not proved that the system of entrusting all our reserve to a single board, like that of the Bank directors, is very anomalous; that it is very dangerous; that its bad consequences, though much felt, have not been fully seen.' A third of a century has elapsed since these words were written, and naturally the conditions of the London money market—both the absolute conditions and the relative conditions²—have materially altered; but the principles of sound banking have not altered. They are immutable. The first principle is that there must be a reasonable reserve held against deposits payable on demand, and when Mr. Bagehot wrote he thought that our reserve was insufficient.

Now, in order to get a right and reasonable view, we must not take special instances when the Bank's stock of gold has been particularly low, or when it has been particularly high, owing to temporary circumstances—we must look at averages. In the three years ending in 1873 the average holding of bullion in the Bank of England was 23,000,000*l.*, and the average for the three years ending 1905 was 35,000,000*l.*; so that there has been a gain in the thirty-three

² As instances of the change in relative conditions I may mention that Mr. Bagehot stated the known bank deposits in Paris in 1873 as only 13,000,000*l.*, whereas to-day there are four institutions in Paris (the *Crédit Lyonnais* and the *Comptoir d'Escompte* being the best known) which hold amongst them 100,000,000*l.* of deposits, nearly equal to the 120,000,000*l.* of the known deposits of the London banks in 1873; and the deposits in the banks of the United States, which in 1873 were less than the deposits in the British banks, are now double the British banks' deposits, 2,000,000,000*l.* against 900,000,000*l.*

years of 12,000,000*l.* But the liabilities on deposits of all the banks in the United Kingdom, including the Savings Banks, were 500,000,000*l.* in 1873, and they are 1,100,000,000*l.* to-day. This is the position in a nutshell. The amount of such liabilities on demand has more than doubled since 1873, but the bullion held by the Bank of England, the one reserve, has not doubled. It was 23,000,000*l.* in 1873, and 35,000,000*l.* in 1905.

. Perhaps the easiest way to appreciate the change in the position is to divide the period we are discussing into two separate parts, and we shall find that in 1873 the ratio of gold in the Bank of England to the total deposit liability was 4·60 per cent. Since then we have added 600,000,000*l.* to the banking liabilities, but we have only added 12,000,000*l.* to the gold in the Bank of England; so that against the *increase* of liabilities in the second period the ratio of gold has been only 2 per cent. Again, if we take the average holding of gold in 1905 at 35,000,000*l.*, the ratio is 3·20 per cent. to the whole 1,100,000,000*l.* deposit liability, and on two occasions in the last six months the gold has been down to 31,000,000*l.* If, therefore, a ratio of 4·60 gave some cause for searching of heart in 1873, a ratio of only 3 per cent. naturally arouses us to grave consideration, with a determination to look into the causes which have produced this effect. For we ought to investigate not only the amount of gold in the Bank of England, but also the gold *in the country*, to which Lord Faber made allusion.

We would naturally expect that the amount of gold held in Great Britain must now be very much greater than in 1873, were we not told on responsible authority—that is, on the authority of a gentleman who, as President of the County Bankers' Association, must be constantly and intimately in touch with the country bank managers—that there is a gold famine, or, let us say, scarcity. It is very difficult in England to arrive at the facts, because there are really no trustworthy data. In France they pay much more attention to financial and monetary statistics. But there are certain figures which are easily accessible in the Board of Trade returns. During the last thirty-three years the recorded imports of gold into this country have exceeded the recorded exports by 110,000,000*l.*, or at an average rate of 3,300,000*l.* a year. This at first sight would seem to be a very considerable increase. But from this excess of imports we have to deduct the amount used in arts and manufactures, and the amounts that filter away in the pockets of emigrants and tourists, of which amounts there are absolutely no records. We are reduced to form estimates or guesses. As a working hypothesis let us assume for the moment that 1,200,000*l.*³ a year is consumed in arts and manufactures, and that 2,100,000*l.* a year is the balance of gold going out of the country

³ This is the mean between the United States Mint's estimate of 2,000,000*l.* a year as the British consumption in arts and manufactures and the English Mint's estimate of 500,000*l.* a year for jewellery alone.

in the pockets of emigrants and tourists. We must remember that there has been an average emigration during these thirty-three years of about 275,000 persons a year, besides many hundreds of thousands of tourists—in all, about 700,000 people a year going out of this country to non-European and European countries, all of whom take away gold in their pockets—perhaps on an average 3*l.* per head, or possibly more; and they bring back very little.

The tourist goes abroad with the purpose of spending the sovereigns in his purse as well as his circular notes. The emigrant, speaking generally, takes his whole capital in his pocket; and the returning immigrant is either one who has failed of success, and therefore has little or nothing in his pocket, or he has succeeded and is coming home on a visit; in which latter case he does not bring gold in his pocket, but he supplies himself in America, or Australia, or wherever he may be, with a banker's draft for the money that he will require whilst in Europe. He has become a small capitalist. Therefore it seems reasonable to assume that the gold coming into Great Britain in people's pockets is a mere fraction of the gold going out in this way, and the considerable amount of English gold coins to be seen abroad compared with the small amount of foreign gold to be seen in England furnishes confirmatory evidence.

If, then, the 3,300,000*l.* a year excess of gold imports has been used up in this way, it must follow that there is no more gold in this country to-day than there was in 1873. But it may be said that these estimates are exaggerated. To test this we may put the figures in the following form. The excess of recorded gold imports for the seventeen years 1873 to 1889 was only at the rate of about 1,000,000*l.* a year, whilst the excess for the period 1890 to 1905 was at the rate of 6,000,000*l.* a year. Now if, for instance, we were to reduce our estimate for the claims of the arts and manufactures, tourists, and emigrants to 2,000,000*l.* (instead of 3,300,000*l.*), and if we deduct that from the 6,000,000*l.* excess of imports, there would be an apparent increase of 4,000,000*l.* a year in the stock of gold in the country, which in the last fifteen years would amount to 60,000,000*l.* increase; and if that were so attention would scarcely be called to-day to a 'famine of gold,' or scarcity, in the country, whatever may have been the case between 1873 and 1889. On the other hand, it is more than possible that the estimate of 3,300,000*l.* a year may be too small, for, by the same method of reasoning, if we deduct that amount from the 6,000,000*l.* average yearly excess of imports in the last fifteen years, we shall then show an increase of 40,500,000*l.* in the country's stock of gold, and in that case also there would be no justification for calling public attention to scarcity. As I shall presently show, there is no evidence of such increase in the stock of gold during the last thirty-five years.

And now we may come to another very important part of the

question—viz. the amount of gold which Great Britain owes to-day to foreign banks and credit institutions. Here again, for illustration, let us take an exceedingly moderate estimate, say 35,000,000*l.*, of which a very large proportion is French money, and a great deal of it is payable on demand.

It must be borne in mind that these foreign funds, whether 35,000,000*l.*, or more, or less, have not come to us in the shape of gold, for we know from the Board of Trade returns that on balance we export a great deal more gold to foreign countries than we import from them. British possessions exclusively supply the balance of imports of gold, and no British possessions are creditors with Great Britain; their gold pays their debts. Therefore these foreign funds have come to us either in the shape of imported commodities that we have not yet paid for to the country of origin—that is, the proceeds of the sales of these commodities are still lent at call in Lombard Street—or they have come to us in the shape of travellers' cheques, which are sent over in sheaves to the London agencies of the various foreign banks and credit institutions. If, for instance, the *Crédit Lyonnais* in London receives one day 10,000*l.* of these travellers' cheques from its Continental correspondents, it does not at once draw the gold for them, but it lends the money out or invests it in sterling bills, so long as the rate of interest in London is higher than the rate of interest in Paris. And this has been the case for very many years past. But if ever circumstances, political or social (or a change of French loans from the London to the New York money market), should arise to make a keen demand for gold by Paris, it can always be taken instantly from the London market. We have never paid sufficient attention to these unrecorded liabilities for travellers' credits; and we have to take into account that they not only include the vast sums spent on the Continent by British tourists, but also the lion's share of, perhaps, equally great sums spent by American tourists. It might naturally be supposed that the United States would furnish the gold for these tourists in Europe, but this is not the case. What happens is that shipments of cotton, breadstuffs, provisions, and other articles of American export, chiefly to Great Britain, pay for these tourists' expenses. During the last nine years the excess of merchandise exports from the United States over imports amounts on average to 100,000,000*l.* a year. This sum is much more than sufficient to pay the interest on their debt held in Europe, the freights on their imports, and the expenses of their travellers; and previous to 1898 they provided the funds, in London, by shipments of securities—railway bonds and shares. So that on average we do not receive in England, and have not received during the last thirty-three years, any balance of gold from the United States, and American gold coins are practically never seen in Europe in the hands of tourists. Therefore, sooner or later, we may have to find this gold and pay it over

to the foreign holders of these travellers' cheques still uncollected, whenever such holders may demand payment in gold, supposing that the holders belong to a creditor country like France. In a word, we have received the funds from the United States to pay their travellers' expenses, but we have not yet paid over all these funds to the Continental holders of the cheques. There are balances still figuring among our bank deposits as debts payable on demand in gold.

Year by year this liability for travellers' credits mounts up, until it reaches very big figures indeed, and it goes some way towards accounting for the persistently adverse foreign exchanges, particularly with France and Italy; and also it may to some extent account for what would otherwise seem almost incredible—that there is a decreasing quantity of gold in this country belonging to the people of this country. The changing habits of our people also tend to mask the phenomena. The extraordinary increase in the number of the branches of town and country banks has enormously decreased the amount of cash that used formerly to be kept in private houses. Even thirty-three years ago the universality of bank accounts was more or less confined to the upper-middle classes, and fifty years ago, in every great house and in every upper-middle-class house, all the household accounts were paid in notes or coin, so that there was almost always a considerable stock of money in such houses; and, relatively speaking, the same may be said of the lower-middle classes and of the artisans and mechanics. To-day, in even very well-to-do houses, it might be difficult to find 5*l.* or 10*l.* in cash (unless the people are bridge players); and all tradesmen and many artisans and mechanics, both in town and country, have now bank accounts; whilst among the more thrifty of the poorer classes the surplus cash goes straight into the Savings Bank, and it is all swept up to Lombard Street, so that a very considerable depletion of gold may very conceivably have taken place in the country without being observed.

But, even supposing that we have more gold in the country than in 1873, it is absolutely certain that the amount subject to the instant claims of foreigners has very greatly increased—has increased by a much larger sum than the 12,000,000*l.* which has been added to the bullion in the Bank of England, whilst at the same time the work thrown on our gold is constantly increasing. We have seen that the liabilities for deposits on demand have more than doubled; the trade transactions have more than doubled, as may be inferred from the bankers' clearings, which are now more than twice those of 1873. The excess of the recorded imports of general merchandise over the recorded exports is now three times greater. We have also added ten millions to our population; and some explanation is required of the anomaly that Great Britain—the financial centre and clearing-house of the world—is the only

country in the world that has not demonstrably increased its store of gold to any appreciable extent during these thirty-three years.

It is necessary to go into the question with, perhaps, wearisome detail because, although it is quite true, from one point of view, that gold in bank vaults is of all forms of wealth the most useless, and we do not wish to make a fetish of it, still it is, nevertheless, certain that no country can see its stock of gold running down—whilst the stocks of gold in all other countries are running up—without a certain amount of anxiety or misgiving, and I am not aware that the position in this country has ever been carefully examined from this standpoint. Needless to say, it ought to be examined with very great attention, because we ought always to be prepared for sudden war demands as well as for mercantile or banking demands for gold. It will be remembered that our experience in 1901 did not show affluence of coin, and a wise nation ought always to keep emergencies in view. The direct evidence given above goes to show a tendency to depletion, and the only indirect evidence, so far as I know, that shows any increase of gold in Great Britain during the last thirty or forty years is in the Deputy-Master of the Mint's report for 1903, in which he refers to various estimates of the amount of gold in circulation, and, amongst others, to Mr. Jevons's estimate in 1868 of 80,000,000*l.*, which may be compared with the Royal Mint's own estimate of 93,500,000*l.* in 1903. This is a gain of 13,500,000*l.* in thirty-five years, or just about the amount shown above as the increase in the Bank of England's stock of gold during the same period. But, of course, the Mint takes no account of the increased amount of gold due to foreigners on demand; and the question arises whether the English people did not have command over a good deal more of the 80,000,000*l.* in 1868 than they have command over the 93,500,000*l.* in 1906. That seems to me to be the crucial point. We must cease to count gold as belonging to Great Britain which really belongs to France.

But it may be said that whilst we owe a great deal of money to France to-day, the United States owes a great deal of money to us; and I believe that this is the case. We are carrying in London a large amount of American stocks for American holders. There is this essential difference, however, from the banker's point of view—that whereas the *Crédit Lyonnais* or the *Comptoir d'Escompte*, in dealing with their money at call in the London market, can present cheques any day on the Bank of England and can demand gold for them, there is no means of taking gold in such instantaneous fashion from New York; and we must bear in mind that there is no cessation apparent yet in the demand for liquid capital in the United States for the development of its resources, and if the banks there go on increasing their loans to meet this demand for capital they must also, at the same time, increase their reserves of gold, so that they will be very averse to any gold shipments to London, because such gold shipments on any considerable scale would

lead to chaos in the New York stock market. Wherever we are dealing with liabilities on demand the element of *time* may be a vital element. Sudden movements are what we have to guard against. Hence the necessity for a good reserve of gold. The most useful contribution that could be made to the discussion of the question would be well-informed estimates from time to time of the amount of cash that could be instantly demanded from London by foreign countries, compared with the amount that could be instantly demanded by London from foreign countries.

This leads us to consider the *reason* of the present uneasy state of things both in the London and in the New York money markets, and it appears to me that the reason is self-evident. It is over-borrowing all round. Naturally this over-borrowing leads to record figures in both countries of imports, exports, clearing returns, income tax, &c.; but we have to ask ourselves if this increasing business is all quite sound. My own attention was originally drawn to the subject by observing the marked increase in the scale of expenditure in England, which became very noticeable about the time of the Jubilee year 1897. In the following seven years—1898–1904—we exported to foreign countries on balance 80,000,000*l.* of gold, and during the same seven years we received from British possessions (principally from South Africa and Australia) a net import of 120,000,000*l.*, so that there is an increase shown by the recorded figures of 40,000,000*l.* gold since 1898. Where is this 40,000,000*l.* now? After deducting the 3,300,000*l.* a year which we have assumed for arts and manufactures and travellers' takings, there ought to be a balance of 17,000,000*l.* somewhere. We know that it is not in the Bank of England, because the Bank's average holding in 1904 was just the same as in 1898. There is no direct evidence of a gain of 17,000,000*l.* in the gold circulating in this country. On the contrary, the indirect evidence of the Mint's report of 1903 is that the total increase of gold in circulation was only 1,000,000*l.* in the previous eight years; whilst the multiplication of banking facilities meanwhile has decreased the probability of accumulation in the people's pockets.⁴

I think, too, it will be universally admitted that during these seven years there has been an absolute consensus of opinion amongst experts that every effort should be made by Great Britain to increase the gold reserve in the Bank of England. It will also, I believe, be universally admitted that the amount of money in London which is at the call of foreign holders, such as the *Crédit Lyonnais* and the *Comptoir d'Escompte*, has increased during that period more than in any previous period. And, furthermore, it can be established

⁴ I learn from the largest employers of labour in England, a concern which employs 30,000 men, that among their workmen 'the plan of keeping money in the house has practically ceased to exist.'

from the Board of Trade returns that the balance of our exports of gold to foreign countries, has been greater in these seven years than in any previous seven-year period.

Now, the only reason why foreign countries can take away our gold, at a time when we are most particularly anxious to keep what we have got and to increase our store, is that we have imported commodities or securities from these countries beyond what our recorded and 'invisible' exports of commodities or securities can pay for, and that, consequently, the rates of exchange with the outside world are constantly against us. The figures given above suggest that there is a leak somewhere in our reservoir, and until we have located that leak and taken measures to plug it we shall have no safety in our supply of specie. It may be troublesome now to stop the leak, but it will turn out to be more than troublesome if we put off attending to it. No attention is yet being paid to this aspect of the question, although there is a good deal of talk about a Royal Commission to regulate the proportions of the reserve of gold to be held as between the Bank of England and the joint-stock banks. But the real problem is, not how to get the gold into these reserves, but how to *keep* it there under our present methods of doing business. The fact is that we ought all to know more, and to care more, about the handling of these vast sums of money. The right and reasonable management of our finance is the most important thing we have got to attend to in this country. It is fundamental and it is absolutely vital; yet very few people exercise their minds on it. If one looks back through the money articles for the last eight years, there is always an expectation expressed of a coming boom in prices of securities, whereas the leaders of financial opinion ought to have been warning us against our extravagance, as shown in our excess of imports of commodities. Up to this very day all the English newspapers, without a single exception, so far as I know, keep on rejoicing over these increasing imports—the figures for the first half of 1906 are by far the largest on record—as showing the wonderful spending power of the country, whilst in the same breath they are all, with one accord, urging an increase of our gold reserves, not apparently recognising that the two processes are mutually exclusive. We never imported so much gold into this country as we have done in the last eight years, and nevertheless, as I have said, the stock of gold in the Bank of England is just the same as it was in 1898.

We shall very shortly have to consider the autumnal demands for coin. There is no reason for supposing that those demands will be less in 1906 than they were in 1905. It is true that the Bank of England has had a considerable accession to its gold since May, but the stock is still^s rather less than it was last year, and we

^s On the 19th of July.

know how uncomfortably small the reserve became last December. We are paying now about 230,000,000*l.* a year for our imported food for man and beast and for tobacco, whilst thirty-three years ago we were paying only 150,000,000*l.* for the same articles; and so on all through our list of imports. We must also keep our eyes open to the demands of Russia, Japan, the United States, India, and the Colonies for liquid capital. We send this capital out in the shape of exports of commodities settled for in paper promises to pay, which do not help us to pay for our imports. The borrowers give us their bonds, or stock certificates, and in return we provide them with goods produced by English labourers living to a great extent on imported food, for which food we have to pay in cash.* For instance, every year we have to send sovereigns to the Argentine to pay for wheat and meat. And it is not only to backward countries like the Argentine that we send gold. We have shipped to Germany during the last thirty-three years 100,000,000*l.* of gold on balance. And that is the way the money goes.

We really want to overhaul our whole system of judging our trade by figures which have not been submitted to expert analysis, or we may very easily come to thoroughly false conclusions owing to a faulty method.

The only result of the last eight years' endeavour to create a psychological atmosphere of optimistic confidence is that the state of the money market is rather more uncomfortable to-day than it was eight years ago.

The plain truth is that if the conditions are not fundamentally sound no amount of writing things up will make them move up. A very good instance was what happened after the signature of peace with the Boers in May 1902. Speculators were tumbling over one another to buy Consols at 95 or 96 and South African gold-mining shares at about double their present prices, and a good many of those speculators have been carrying their purchases ever since on borrowed money. But it was really very easy to see in 1902 that, of all things likely to happen, a boom was the least probable. Yet, with one or two exceptions, there was scarcely a warning voice raised. Almost all the leaders of financial opinion rather encouraged than discouraged the speculators. We do not want either optimism or pessimism. What we do want is to see things as they are. Nothing can be prejudiced by looking into our balance-sheet, but everything may be hazarded by not looking into it. When we suspect the existence of unsound conditions, the most helpful thing to do is to examine the symptoms, with a view to applying a remedy; and my own belief is that, in the ultimate analysis, the growing magnitude of our imports will be found to be at the root of the trouble. It is quite true that lately British exports have been increasing even more rapidly than the imports, but, from the point of

view of the reserves of gold, 'we must ascertain the proportion of these exports that is being settled for in paper promises to pay. When an exhaustive analysis has been made of the true relation between our imports and our exports by competent authorities at the Board of Trade or at the Treasury, I think we shall find that the effects of too rapid conversion of floating capital into fixed capital are much more serious than we have yet realised.

We might have expected that the speeches at the bankers' dinner on the 11th of July should throw some additional light on the question. But we do not get much. Lord Goschen in one sentence said: 'Here we were with enormous liabilities and with a smaller stock of gold than any other country held. He was inclined to believe that they were unanimous that that was not a satisfactory situation.' And in a following sentence, 'At present a great current of trade and finance was going on on a sound basis.'

Can the finance be really on a sound basis at present when Lord Goschen himself and all the audience of bankers are unanimous in thinking that the situation is not satisfactory?

Then Mr. Asquith said: 'He had always thought—and he still thought—that one of the greatest assets of this country was to maintain here in England, and particularly in the City of London, the freest and most open market in the whole world.'

But if the result is that to-day the financial situation is not satisfactory, it may be said that in this freest and most open market in the world we have been overweighted by excess of imports, and that consequently we have been unable to maintain adequate gold reserves.

In this article I have attempted to indicate that these two forces—excess of imports and insufficiency of gold—operating together as cause and consequence over a series of years afford some explanation of the existing malaise of the money market.

J. W. CROSS.

•

THE PROBLEM OF HOME LIFE IN SOUTH AFRICA

THERE is probably no question of greater political importance to the Imperial destinies of South Africa than that connected with the creation of those economic and political conditions which permit of the establishment of a permanent 'home life,' especially near to or within those centres of industrial activity where both skilled and unskilled labour are most required.

It has been said, not altogether without some justification, that the discovery of the rich goldfields of the Witwatersrand has been largely responsible for the destruction of home life and for the introduction of those restless and speculative conditions of life which have been so disturbing and detrimental to its settled and satisfactory existence.

Paul Kruger used to taunt the Uitlander delegates for the franchise, and others coming to him on similar missions, by saying that the Uitlanders only came to the Transvaal to take out the gold, and that when satisfied they would leave the country and proceed to disgorge themselves in the capitals of Europe, and would, in fact, never be content, as the Boers were, to make their permanent home in the land. I would ask : Is this not very largely still the case ?

Those who have carefully studied the economic conditions of the Transvaal, even as they exist to-day after numerous and enlightened endeavours to improve them, especially by the adoption of a progressive railway policy, do not deny that there is still a very great deal to be accomplished before the self-respecting, educated, and intelligent artisan, business or professional man, will be content to call the Transvaal his '*Home*,' in the same sense and true patriotic spirit that the Boer is content to regard it.

It is true that a certain comparatively small number of men with more or less independent means and imbued with strong political ambitions and the love of power, here and there also possibly genuinely infused with the spirit of Imperialism, will decide to settle down in the country when the Transvaal actually possesses Responsible

Government, with a Constitution such as permits of the Government of the country being conducted without any undue interference from Downing Street.

In the best interests of the country it is undeniable that it is most desirable that the legislators to be elected to the Transvaal House of Representatives should be selected, not only from those possessed of large independent fortunes, but also from those representative of labour, not of the working-man element only, but also that of mental labour as represented by the professions, the commercial and trade interests of the country.

All those resident in the Transvaal who now so impatiently await the advent of Responsible Government are puzzling out answers to this complicated position—i.e. a fair representation of the interests of the country in the face of a still abnormal cost of living. They, like myself, look forward with somewhat grim anticipation to the results which may obtain when Responsible Government is an achieved fact, unless it be made possible for self-respecting emigrants from Great Britain and elsewhere—not the waste products, physically and morally, of the world—to make their permanent home in the Transvaal in like manner to the Boer.

The steadily increasing population of the country which should finally result in such a reduction of the cost of living as to permit of others besides Boers, natives, and Asiatics making their permanent home life in the Transvaal, can only be brought about when at least some of the prime necessities of life are produced within it. If it cannot be the loaf factor, which is probably the case, it most certainly can be meat, and it is only a question of a plentiful supply of cheap unskilled labour to make it possible to manufacture articles from iron, steel, copper, tin, earthenware, and other mineral products in which the Transvaal abounds, together with a cheap and excellent supply of coal; also articles from wool, cotton, and leather.

This terribly hard political nut can only be cracked by those who can solve the labour question. There are about one million whites or Europeans resident in all the South African States and Protectorates included in the Empire, and about five to six million natives or aboriginal inhabitants of South Africa, and a few hundred thousand Asiatics, Chinese, British Indian coolies, and Malays resident on a land area equal to one million square miles. According to a return issued by the Native Affairs Department of the Transvaal, as will be seen from the following statement, there are some 94,000 natives employed principally underground in the mining industries of the Transvaal, and 84,000 in other employments—that is, in domestic service, on the agricultural lands, municipal, railway, and other works—making a total of 178,000.

TERRITORIAL ANALYSIS OF NATIVES HOLDING PASSPORTS IN LABOUR DISTRICTS.

31st of March, 1906.

Territory	Mines and Works	Other Employers	Total
Basutoland	3,501	6,193	9,694
British Bechuanaland	1,182	1,428	2,608
British Central Africa	2,555	294	2,849
Cape Colony	8,431	18,390	26,821
Natal and Zululand	3,257	14,092	17,349
Orange River Colony	350	5,038	5,388
East Coast	56,352	—	—
Mozambique } Portuguese Territory	2,355	6,154	65,739
Quilimane	878	—	—
Rhodesia	3,396	940	4,345
Swaziland	1,034	1,600	2,634
Transvaal	10,844	30,058	40,902
Damaraland	502	21	523
Others	164	362	526
Total	94,801	84,577	179,378

NATIVE AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT,

25th of April 1906.

More than half this number is derived from Portuguese territory, and in what hereafter follows this fact should be steadily remembered, seeing that it means that all wages saved by this foreign labour contingent must be taken out of British possessions, much in the same manner that a proportion of saved earnings of a similar number of Chinese coolies is taken out of the country.

The greatest misfortune of all, however, is the fact that the whole of this immense army of labour, amounting to at least a quarter of a million able-bodied men if the white skilled labour is also included, must very largely for months and even years live a totally unnatural existence, cut off from all home life.

It was with the intention of quickly resuscitating the mining industry of the Transvaal after the war, upon the prosperity of which the whole of South Africa mainly depends, that it was found imperative to import additional unskilled labour, and apparently it was from the northern districts of China only from which labour physically fit and acclimatised to South African conditions could be imported in sufficient quantity.

During the war the native labour contingent had got more or less out of hand, demoralised by good pay, and so independent that it was evident that something would have to be done to demonstrate to the native mind that it did not hold the mining industry and the prosperity of South Africa generally in the grip of its black palm. In

other words, a little healthy competition might finally persuade the Kaffir that, as the report of the Commission on Native Affairs puts it,

we live in days when the great mass of civilised humanity, with little exception, has to work, and work very hard, every day and every year; it is therefore neither wise of Government nor kind to the African natives to place them in a position to exist without giving to their country a fair contribution of the energy and labour which every other race is called upon and, indeed, forced by their natural conditions to give.

At the present time, out of a total of some 94,000 natives employed on mines and works, fully 60 per cent. are imported from Portuguese territory, leaving only 30,000 odd to be taken from a total population of four to five million natives residing in British territories. According to the estimates made in the report of the Commission on Native Affairs in South Africa, about one-fifth of this total population may be taken as representing able-bodied men capable of labouring on the mines and in other industries, or, say, one million Kafirs.

Now, surely in the name of all that is reasonable, if it is possible to induce some 50,000 Chinese coolies to leave wife and family and home life for three years and travel several thousand miles, practically tempted by a high rate of wage, then it should also be possible to introduce such conditions of life for the native in or near to the industrial centres of the Transvaal as would induce, say, at least, one-tenth of this whole native population now resident in British possessions, or, say, 100,000 natives and their families, to gradually settle and make their home life near to the points where their labour is most needed. In other words, to quote from one of the recommendations made in the report of the Native Affairs Commission, .

The creation, subject to adequate control, of native locations for residential purposes near labour centres or elsewhere is proof that they are needed.

From a statement issued by the Native Affairs Department in the Transvaal it is clear that out of some, say, 180,000 or so of natives employed altogether in the Transvaal, a varying number of, say, from 6,000 to 8,000 are always leaving work and going back to their homes and a more or less similar number take their place.

Now, in order to maintain the industry on the present basis of gold output and supply sufficient labour for other mines in course of development and which will pay well to work, some 150,000 unskilled native and Chinese coolie labourers are required, so that an additional 50,000 unskilled labourers at least are needed.

It follows, therefore, that if indentured Chinese coolie labour is to be prohibited after the present contracts expire, then it is imperative for the prosperity of South Africa and also of a section of manufacturing Great Britain, and the physically fit and competent of British unemployed labour, that some policy be at once initiated to attract the

settlement of an ever-increasing native population who could make their homes and live their lives near to the centres of industry.

RETURN SHOWING INCREASE AND WASTAGE AMONG NATIVES EMPLOYED ON MINES AND WORKS AND BY OTHER EMPLOYERS IN LABOUR DISTRICTS.

31st of March 1906.

	Mines and Works.	Other Employers	Total
Initial Registrations	8,543	9,495	18,038
Deserters recovered	155	124	279
Transfers from other labour districts	1,267	2,113	3,380
Total increase	9,965	11,732	21,697
Died	296	33	329
Deserted	699	416	1,115
Transfers to other labour districts	1,233	3,242	4,475
Transfers to other parts	399	997	1,396
Returned home	6,259	7,501	13,760
Total wastage	8,886	12,189	21,075
Net increase	—	—	622

Those mines on the Rand which to-day employ Kaffirs only, and have always held the reputation amongst the natives of being well fed and well housed and not too much worried or overseered, find little difficulty in maintaining the requisite number, and many 'boys' have been even known to remain for years without even returning to their kraals. It is therefore somewhat absurd to argue that natives cannot stand the winter seasons, provided always that their women and children are well housed and gradually acclimatised. The ancient ruined kraals seen in all the surrounding districts are sufficient evidence also that the Kaffir can live in these districts. Surely the settlement of a few thousand families could at least be given a trial by the mining companies giving to the natives fairly watered and arable lands, which are now lying idle, and letting them enter into final possession after remaining in service for a term of years, always on the conditions that such lands could not be sold or transferred and might be forfeited for misbehaviour, and were not so situated as to depreciate the value of other ground.

A large, permanently resident native population, within fair walking or branch railway or electric tram communication with the mines and other works, would largely add to the prosperity of the country, seeing that the wages of over 50,000 natives is under present conditions largely expended in Portuguese territory.

In the past Boer farmers and others on private lands were able to hold out sufficient inducement to natives to come and squat on them on condition that they lived rent-free and gave part of their labour and crops to the owner of the farm; surely then the mines could hold out even far more tempting inducements.

Under such conditions we should finally possess a permanent native (Kaffir) mining community on the Rand, whose offspring in males could, whilst young, help in the sorting of the ore, as is done by the miners' sons in the German ore-dressing establishments, whilst the females could be educated to become useful and reasonably paid domestic servants, the want of which now makes the 'home life' for the white labourer's wife such a heartbreaking occupation. It is, after all, the woman more than the man who helps to build up the 'home life,' and where she cannot be *the country is lost*. It must also be borne in mind that it is reasonable to assume that instead of employing some 10,000 house-boys as domestic servants, their place would be taken by an equal number of women, and consequently liberate this number of house 'boys' for work upon lands now lying idle.

I have no doubt that had all the immense amount of money and trouble which has been expended by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association been applied to settling natives near to the mining centres, we should by this time not have been at political loggerheads with the most powerful of Liberal Governments over the question of Chinese indentured labour, and all the malodorous questions which such an experiment of necessity involves.

Black, white, and yellow men are all alike in one respect, and it is precisely that one which so greatly helps to build up a nation as it builds up a family—namely, the love of the land of your birth and home, one of the strongest instincts of animal life. Anything more uneconomic and unnatural than to be always shifting your labour, white, black, and yellow, backwards and forwards from the 'home life' instead of practically breeding it on the spot where it is most required can hardly be imagined.

Let me again quote from the report of the South African Native Affairs Commission :

They (the natives) are attached to their homes, and even when they go away to labour-centres to earn money, prefer in general to do so for short periods and then to return and look after the interests of the family and the welfare of the stock, participate in the sociable joys of beer gatherings, and superintend the ploughing for the coming year. So long as it is impossible for the native to marry and make his home, return nightly to his family and live comfortably near the great centres of labour, so long will there be the yearning to return frequently to his distant home, and so long will the flow of labour be impeded by this really amiable trait in his character.

The Commission has visited and inspected several municipal locations, and records its opinion that in some respects their condition leaves much to be

desired. The natives who reside in or frequent these locations are in the main working people. As such there is every reason why they should be encouraged to stay as useful members of the community. The tendency of inadequate accommodation is to make them dissatisfied and restless; the standard of comfort is low, and they are liable to be overcrowded and overcharged.

The object should be to afford those who desire it the opportunity of acquiring in their own right holdings for residential purposes within these locations, and, with or without this, encouragement to make, and security for, improvements.

In establishing these locations easy access to the place where the natives go to work should be kept in view. The charges necessary to be borne by the natives, in the way of rent, &c., and railway fares, should be as low as possible. The Commission thinks that the charges at present imposed are in some cases too high, and although a substantial revenue may thereby accrue to municipal treasuries and railway departments, they ultimately fall on the employers, who have to pay correspondingly high wages.

These locations should not be made a refuge for surplus or idle natives, for whose labour there is no local demand or who will not work, and power to expel such natives from the location and from the entire urban area should be vested in the local authority, who should receive the full support of Government in this work.

In view of the undoubted fact that the gold-mining industry is the backbone of South Africa, upon which the port towns of Durban, East London, Port Elizabeth, and Cape Town very largely depend for their respective revenues, this phase of the labour question becomes one of inter-State importance; and upon its right solution the final federation or unification of the South African States mainly depends. It should therefore be promptly dealt with by a special commission of the Intercolonial Council, or possibly by a Royal Commission, as it is so largely Imperial. If necessary, the respective Governors might, as is now the case with the Governor of Natal, have it within their power to call upon the native chiefs in South Africa to supply proportionately the 200,000 natives required by the mining industry.

At the present time some 60 per cent. of the white labour supply for the mining industry is obtained from Portuguese territory, and apparently Natal, which possesses the necessary population, prohibits its use by the Transvaal, and prefers, whilst in an almost bankrupt state, to collect a petty hut tax and involve itself in a native war, rather than give to the Transvaal the labour which would save it from bankruptcy. The native war in Natal costs that unhappy colony far more in a few months' time than is collected from the natives in a whole year, owing to its insistence on an unpopular form of taxation. In the report of the South African Native Affairs Commission it states:

There are in Natal more natives living on private lands than on the locations and mission reserves combined. The figures show 421,080 natives on private farms and 265,603 natives on locations and mission reserves. Natives on private farms pay annual rents varying from 1*l.* to 5*l.*, and in some cases more. A large number render service in lieu of rent. They pay to Government in addition a

hut tax of 14s. per hut per annum. A great number of natives live on lands owned by absentee landlords, for which they pay rent.

Crown lands in Natal are occupied by natives who are subject to certain conditions of occupation and have now to pay 2l. per annum in addition to hut tax. The payment of rent by natives occupying Crown lands has not been extended to the province of Zululand, on the ground that the land question in that province is still a subject of consideration.

In all this there is much which, read between the lines, gives us pause for serious reflection. The sympathy of certain Zulu chiefs with the rebel natives of Natal can easily be appreciated, and Natal might at the present juncture with advantage pay serious attention to its own economic position and try, say, to obtain a portion of the money paid for wages to the Kaffir which is now pouring into Portuguese pockets.

In the Transvaal By-law No. 4, 1885, which has not been repealed, the State President was constituted paramount chief over all chiefs and natives in the Republic. He was empowered further, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, to make and frame regulations for the administration of the law. These powers are now exercised by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. In Southern Rhodesia the Administrator in Council exercises over natives all political power and authority. The powers given in the two latter cases are in many points analogous and similar to those conferred on the Governor of Natal as supreme chief; if anything, they are more extensive and comprehensive, but the authority is not given in either case to enforce compulsory labour, *which is given to the Governor of Natal*.

In this connection the Native Affairs Commission states that the Commission does not recommend abrogation of the special powers which have been described, but in respect of the self-governing colonies or possessions as they become self-governing, it feels that such powers should be regulated in Parliamentary enactment, and that the responsibility of their application should rest under constitutional usage with the Ministry of the day responsible in all its actions to the local Legislature.

I cannot too strongly urge upon all those who are interested in South African affairs, and especially those dealing with the labour question, to carefully read and digest the report of the Commission appointed to sit upon the native affairs of South Africa, of which Sir Godfrey Lagden, Commissioner of Native Affairs in the Transvaal, was the chairman.

It too often happens that in the excitement of political controversy, these carefully prepared Government reports resulting from the examination of hundreds of witnesses, all having some special knowledge of native questions, and finally drafted by some of the most experienced, are either overlooked or ignored.

From all that I have said I do not wish it to be understood that I contend that the Chinese indentured labour was a mistake or un-

necessary, nor would I even advocate its dismissal on the termination of the present contract agreements, as I consider it is essential to maintain such unskilled labour competition. I am, however, inclined to believe that it will be best for the Transvaal not to import more Chinese until some serious effort has been made to induce natives to reside with their families in ever-increasing numbers in or near to the industrial mining centres.

This unskilled labour question for the Transvaal should not be made a party question but should appeal to all sides of the House as the only natural solution of what has hitherto proved an almost insoluble problem. With the assistance of a strong sympathetic Government working together with what might be a loyal and contented people in the Transvaal I am certain that such a scheme as I have suggested could gradually be matured.

EDGAR P. RATHBONE.

INDIA AND THE NEW PARLIAMENT

THE Royal visit that has just terminated has probably created a keener interest in the people of India than has been the case at any other period of the history of her connection with England. It seems also to have quickened the sense of duty towards India which lay dormant among the bulk of the nation. This awakening is best evidenced by the attitude of the new House of Commons towards questions affecting India. Hitherto the humour of the general public has been reflected in the appearance of the House on the occasion of a debate on the Indian Budget, by the languid proceedings and the empty benches. If the present interest is of a permanent and abiding character it furnishes a hopeful augury for the future, for, after all, in the words of the late Viceroy, 'the British Parliament is the ultimate custodian of the rights and liberties of India.' The difficulty, however, of obtaining an insight into the inner thoughts and sentiments of the people leads to a slackening of purpose to keep in touch with their needs and requirements, and ends with the feeling that having entrusted the government of her great dependency to a body of experts, England might regard any further responsibility with an easy conscience. To the minds of many it still presents the picture of an easy-going country, run on fixed, generally unalterable lines—the land of pageants and the home of durbars—the bulk of whose people, untouched by the changes in the conception of the thinking classes occasioned by the contact of two civilisations—one old and stationary, the other young, active, and utilitarian—bow down before the British official as the *avatar* of progress and prosperity. Unfortunately the picture is not altogether complete; behind the stately shows stands a mass of humanity, ignorant, half-starved, and ill-clothed, eking out a meagre living from the soil, whose yielding moods depend on the vagaries of Nature. To them, no doubt, the acts of Governments and the merits of their rulers, and the many questions which agitate the minds of their betters, convey little or no meaning. But this apathy or indifference, born of poverty and ignorance, is hardly predicable of all the lower strata of the Indian population. However narrow the horizon, the interest of a large majority in outside affairs is keen. Current events of the village,

town, or district are discussed, often with intelligence, always with acuteness ; and many of the local incidents frequently become the subject of ballads in which the Indian magnate and the British official are equally held up to ridicule for their different idiosyncrasies, to the amusement of the village gossips.

Seventy years of English education and the gradual diffusion of Western knowledge have created among the more prosperous classes a perception of the responsibilities and obligations of Government, and awakened in them a sense of their rights. However difficult this may make the work of administration, it is hardly possible, even if it were expedient, to alter the current of progress. The great intellectual uprise among the educated sections due to the impact of West and East naturally reacts on the masses. And the spirit of collectivism and organisation which has given birth to so many political and semi-political institutions exercises its legitimate influence. The whole continent, with the exception, perhaps, of tracts inhabited by backward communities, is thus in a state of expectation, eager for development.

In view of the altered conditions it seems essential for the welfare of both countries to maintain a permanency of interest in Parliament and among the public in matters affecting India, and to appreciate so far as possible not only the needs and requirements of the people, but also the aims and aspirations of the literate classes. And one may look to the Indian Parliamentary Committee for help towards educating public opinion on Indian affairs. I may be permitted, however, to observe that it would detract from its influence and usefulness if the Committee were to allow itself to become the mouthpiece of any particular section or class. For it cannot be too often impressed that India is not a homogeneous country inhabited by one race, professing one faith, speaking one language, and animated by one set of ideals. Owing to the unevenness of progress and the unequal diffusion of English education, some are less articulate than others in giving expression to their feelings and ideas. Leaving out of consideration the Christians and Parsis, who are comparatively few in number, two great communities, roughly speaking, are in possession of the country. In most instances their interests run on identical lines ; in some they diverge. In these cases it is the duty of the statesman to reconcile conflicting aims and aspirations, to infuse harmony among discordant elements, to keep in view the ultimate fusion of two peoples destined to live side by side. To override the claims of either, to allow the voice of the majority to stifle that of the minority, would be a mistake. English education, instead of drawing together the races of India, has unfortunately drifted them apart, and rendered the task of government much more difficult.

No doubt it is hard for an English official, however able and sympathetic, to ascertain the feelings of the masses, or look at things

from the popular point of view so essential to a correct perspective. And the most successful administrator is forced to admit a certain inability to gauge the ideas of even the higher classes. Differences of language, manners, and customs are acknowledged barriers to community of thought and social intercourse. The spread of English education has made no difference, and after a hundred and fifty years of rule in the province first acquired by the British, the gulf that divides the rulers and the ruled is as impassable as ever. Whilst much is expected from the fresh awakening of interest in England, no thinking Indian believes that the transfer of the reins of office from one party to another would appreciably affect the general course of policy towards India. The commanding personality of a particular Minister may to some extent lighten the pressure of official traditions, but the atmosphere remains charged with preconceived theories of racial inequality and the unwisdom of relaxing the bonds of tutelage, whilst the Elder Statesmen view with ill-concealed apprehension any change in the direction of liberalisation.

In grappling, then, with the problems of Indian administration, some essential facts should be borne in mind: the divergence in certain cases between the respective interests of the great Indian nationalities, the growth of nationalism of a somewhat exclusive character in one, the material decadence and political inarticulateness of the other, and the rise of a comparatively new and important factor independent of either.

Few observers can have failed to notice the preponderant influence which within recent years the non-official European community has acquired over the counsels of the Indian Government. Twenty years ago the opinions of the British Indian Association, the Central Mahomedan Association, and similar bodies in other parts of India were regarded as important auxiliaries to official sources of information. To-day that position is occupied by the Chambers of Commerce. The views of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, for instance, are received with marked deference; the highest functionaries attend its banquets and expatiate on those occasions on Imperial policy; and each president, on the termination of his service in the Supreme Council, is honoured with a knighthood. The Chamber, guided by able leaders, is no doubt a source of strength to the Government; its pronouncements on public questions are generally characterised by breadth of vision and foresight. But instances are not wanting when its views have been distinctly out of harmony with the feelings of large sections of the Indian people.

Hindu nationalism is at present running in two channels, which it is not at all unlikely might, under stress of circumstances, coalesce at any moment. The *Bharata Dharma Mandal*, a purely indigenous growth, the outcome of genuine Hinduism, proclaims for its object 'the regeneration of India' on strictly orthodox and conservative lines.

The significance of this movement will be understood from the fact that almost without exception the ruling Hindu chiefs, the *Jagat-gurus*, the *Mahants* of the great temples, and the leading priests of the Sikhs, are said to be its 'warm supporters.' The *Calcutta Englishman* sees in the Bharata Dharma Mandal a counterpoise to the National Congress. 'The innate conservatism of the country,' it adds, 'when organised as it is being organised in this thoroughly representative Association, will undoubtedly be a great social and political power.' So it may: what the ultimate tendency will be remains to be seen.

The National Congress, on the other hand, owes its origination to an Anglo-Indian official long retired from the public service. It is the exponent of the aims and aspirations that have come into being under the influence of Western education. The chief objection on the part of the Mahomedans to make common cause with 'the National Congress' is based on the conviction that tied to the wheels of the Juggernaut of majority they would in the end be crushed out of the semblance of nationality.

Whilst the non-official Anglo-Indian and the Hindu communities possess powerful institutions for safeguarding their rights and privileges and asserting their claims to consideration and fair play, the Indian Mussulmans are suffering acutely from political inanition. Material decadence and general want of touch with modern thought have brought about a deplorable state of disintegration. The associations that exist in different parts of the country possess no solidarity and display no conception of the essential requirements of the community. There is no concerted action to prevent the further decline of their people, to promote their advancement, to place before Government their considered views on public matters, or to obtain relief from the mischiefs arising from the misunderstanding of their laws and customs.

To find one nationality not pressing its claims to an equal recognition of its rights is undoubtedly an advantage; it saves embarrassment. Thus, generally speaking, the Mussulman, whilst he is patted on the back for holding aloof from what is called 'political agitation,' and told to apply himself like a good boy to his books, when it comes to practical treatment is relegated to the cold shade of neglect. Official statistics show that in Upper India the proportion of Mahomedans receiving education is greater than that of their Hindu fellow-subjects. In the other provinces they have admittedly made great progress. And yet in the matter of public employment or official recognition they are as unfavourably situated as ever. The reason is simple—they have no political influence, and cannot make their voice properly heard in the council-chamber or office-room.

It must not be supposed, however, that the Mussulmans are devoid of the political instinct or oblivious of the value of collective action. They note as keenly as any other people the signs of the times. And in this lies the seriousness of the situation. In the

absence of a recognised organisation, capable of expressing freely and openly the sentiments and opinions of the Mahomedans as a body, the feelings of the masses are likely to take a wrong shape and find outlet through unregulated channels. Lord Amphill, in his reply to a valedictory address from the Mussulmans of Madras, told them in so many words that as a people they were 'not pushing enough.' 'I think,' he went on to say, 'that it is your greatest fault, and it is also one of your greatest virtues. Most of you are in many respects, most respects, far too modest. You do not push yourselves enough, you do not ask enough, and you do not show yourselves forward enough.' 'Pushfulness, to use a newly coined phrase,' he added, 'can become a fault if it is carried to extremes. But this is an age when everybody is on the alert and active, and it does not do for the Mahomedan community to remain in the background or to keep silence.' Here is the best advice for unity of action and purpose.¹

Whilst each nationality has its special interests and special points of view, there are many questions on which the unanimity is singular and noteworthy. One of these is the relation *inter se* of the two divisions of the Civil Administration, the Judicial and the Executive.

A contest similar to the one recently settled by the new Government in favour of the supremacy of the civil power has existed for years past between these two branches of the public service, in which one has been gaining in prestige and authority to the detriment of the other.

The administration of justice in India supplies to British rule an incontestable claim to the loyalty of the people; any policy likely to detract from the status of the judiciary damages the credit of the Government. Instead of maintaining intact its prestige, the tendency, however, has been in the contrary direction. Formerly the district judge occupied a position of pre-eminence in his district. To-day he is completely obscured by the executive officer. In the Mofussil, as the tract outside the presidency towns is called, the subordinate judicial officers scarcely receive, according to their account, anything like the consideration extended to their executive brethren. In the superior courts the salary of the judges² has been reduced and their precedence in the official hierarchy lowered, whilst, with the evident object of impressing the Indian public, no measure has been neglected to exalt the dignity of the Executive.

Of the courts in India established by Royal Charter the only one

¹ It may be said that I have overlooked the educational activity of the Mahomedans of the North-West. Far be it from me to discount the life that stirs there or in Bengal. But it is my firm conviction that the community which fails to grasp the political situation or lacks the vigour or 'pushfulness' to claim its constitutional rights must, in the long-run, go to the wall.

² 13 Geo. III. cap. cxiii. fixed the pay of a puisne judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature at Fort William, in Bengal, at 6,000*l.* a year; it was reduced later on to 5,000*l.*; now it is barely 3,200*l.*

which is not subordinate to the Provincial Government is the High Court of Judicature in Bengal; and its independence has been a fruitful source of friction, but the attempts to curtail its jurisdiction have so far been frustrated by the force of public opinion. The mischievous consequences of any tampering with the powers of the superior courts are obvious, and are appreciated by no public body more than the Anglo-Indian Chambers of Commerce and the Trades Associations, whose plain-spoken utterances have been invaluable to the public interests.

This brings me to another of the subjects on which there seems to be absolute agreement. One of the anomalies of British administration in India is the combination, even in advanced tracts, in one and the same individual of two distinctly contradictory jurisdictions—the Executive and Judicial. In some parts of the country it is to the advantage of the people that the executive officer should also exercise the functions of a judge, but in provinces like Bengal, Madras, Bombay, the United Provinces, and parts of the Punjab, the system is not only out of harmony with the spirit of the times, but mischievous and irritating, unfair to the officers themselves, and occasioning great hardships to suitors. Apart from the question whether it is right in principle to give to the magistrate who is charged with the preservation of peace and security in a particular locality the power of deciding criminal cases, or to the revenue collector the determination of revenue disputes between the subject and the Crown, there is the further consideration—does not the system interfere with the efficient discharge of either function?

I will give just one instance of how harshly the combination of the two powers in one and the same person works in practice. A criminal case was fixed for trial at the chief town of the district (the Sudder station) on a particular day before the principal magistrate. The defendant duly appeared, but found to his dismay the official had left on tour, fixing the case for another day at another place at a considerable distance from the Sudder station. The defendant proceeded to the latter place, only to find that the magistrate had moved on to another camp. This time the defendant could not put in an appearance on the day fixed, and a warrant was issued for his arrest. On an application to the High Court the case was transferred for trial by another officer at the Sudder station. In his explanation the magistrate submitted that in discharge of his executive duties he had to move about the district. His court was thus as ambulatory as his office!

In this connection the question may appropriately be asked, would it not be in the public interest to do away entirely with the judicial powers of the Divisional Commissioners and the Boards of Revenue in questions arising under the revenue laws, and leave these to the decision of the ordinary courts of justice?

A wider application of the principles of local self-government, a larger recognition of the eligibility of Indians for the higher branches of State service, the expediency of opening the Indian Army as a profession to the sons of the Indian gentry, and of 'settling,' to use the words of a learned Hindu judge, 'the judicial administration of the country on the sounder basis of the consent and approbation of the people to whom the law is administered'²—are questions which must sooner or later engage the serious attention of the statesmen into whose hands the destinies of India are confided.

The management of local affairs by the people themselves is not a British introduction in India. It has been in existence from early times, and was in force under the Mahomedan rulers to a far greater extent than English writers are apt to suppose. Municipal government, even in England, is attended with mistakes; in India they were to be expected. A sympathetic, tactful, and at the same time firm treatment would, instead of marking failure, have led to success. It would have made the respectable sections understand the responsibilities of trust, imparted self-reliance, and trained them to a larger perception of duty as citizens of a great Empire.

It has been sometimes asserted that Indians are unfit for certain offices, and that in certain positions they would not receive the same obedience or deference as Englishmen. This is partly a survival of the old idea which led the East India Company, at the commencement of its rule, to exclude Indians from all share in the Government of the country. Since those days the conception of inequality has become considerably modified. The fitness of Indians for the highest judicial appointments is acknowledged. As regards the inability of members of the virile races of India to command obedience or exact deference, the facts of history disprove the selfish theory. Only this must be remembered; in every country the amount of respect shown to an officer depends upon the consideration in which he is held by his superiors, for the people take him at Government valuation.

What is the reason which closes the Indian Army, as a profession, to the sons of the Indian gentry? The formation of the Imperial Cadet Corps has been rightly treated as a wise piece of statesmanship. It has supplied the scions of princely families with the means not only of learning the value of discipline, but also of indulging a natural taste for pomp and pageantry. The professions of law and medicine are becoming more and more crowded; trade and commerce among the nationalities which possess no commercial aptitude are uncongenial pursuits. In former days much of the energy and activity of the higher classes found occupation and employment in a military career. British policy, by debarring, as a rule, the sons of gentlemen from making the army a profession excepting through the ranks, is slowly emasculating the virile races of India; instead of making their

² Mr. Justice Mitra in the *Law Quarterly Review*, January 1906.

military predilections a source of strength, it is driving them into unworthy and unhealthy, not to say 'dangerous, channels. If after one hundred and fifty years' dominance the British Government cannot open the army as a profession to properly selected members of good families, it implies a stupendous confession of weakness.

The strength of a Government consists not only in the confidence of the people in the purity of judicial administration, but also in its efficiency. The British Government, at the very commencement of its ascendancy in India, assured to the inhabitants by a solemn Act of Parliament the full enjoyment of their laws, customs, and privileges. The preamble to 21 Geo. III. cap. 70 contains one of the most important declarations of policy, the faithful observance of which is the keystone to the whole fabric of the Indian Empire of England.

After reciting that owing to the 'doubts and difficulties which had arisen concerning the true intent and meaning of certain clauses and provisions' of the previous Act (13 Geo. III.), the minds of many inhabitants subject to the Governor-General in Council 'have been disquieted with fears and apprehensions, and further mischiefs may possibly arise from the said misunderstandings and discontents if a reasonable and suitable remedy be not provided; and whereas it is expedient . . . that the inhabitants should be maintained and protected in the enjoyment of all their ancient laws, usages, rights, and privileges,' it proceeded to enact that all actions and suits in the Supreme Court of Judicature at Fort William, in Bengal, 'in the case of Mahomedans shall be determined by the laws and usages of Mahomedans, and in the case of Gentus by the laws and usages of the Gentus.'

This principle, in a somewhat amplified form, was extended by 37 Geo. III. cap. ii. to the Supreme Courts of Madras and Bombay. And in 1793 the local Legislature made the rule applicable to the Mofussil of the Bengal Presidency.⁴

Sir Roland Wilson, in the January number of this Review, criticising an article of mine entitled 'An Indian Retrospect and Some Comments,'⁵ has made the following somewhat extraordinary observation: 'In truth, the whole question of administering Mahomedan law in British India is purely one of public policy. The Government is absolutely unhampered by anything in the nature of a pledge on the subject.' I am afraid the provisions of the statutes to which I have referred must have escaped his notice. The people of India justly regard these repeated declarations of the Legislature as a binding pledge, securing to them the absolute enjoyment of their laws and customs, so long as they were not opposed to any positive enactment or public morality. It must be a surprise to them to be told by an eminent theoretical lawyer of Sir Roland Wilson's standing that the pledge is no pledge.

⁴ Reg. IV. of 1793, s. 15.

⁵ *Nineteenth Century and After*, October 1905.

Whatever may have been the demerits of the East India Company, thus much stands to its credit, that it loyally endeavoured to give effect to the policy of the Legislature. It supplied to the courts of justice the best available means for the ascertainment of the laws and usages they had to administer. Hindu and Mahomedan law officers were attached to every court, whose duty it was to explain to the judge, whenever called upon to do so, the law applicable to the particular case. One instance will show the remarkable care with which the law was administered in the Supreme Court of Bengal. In a case of *wakf*, tried in 1839 before Ryan, C.J., and two other judges, the law officers were required to give their opinion on certain questions propounded by the court, with full references to the authorities and the texts on which they based their answers; those texts were then compared and translated by the sworn interpreters of the court and submitted to the judges, who based their conclusion not only on the opinions of the law officers, but also on the original texts.

The system continued in force for some years after the Crown assumed the sovereignty of India. But with the establishment of the High Courts a change came over the spirit of the administration. The law officers were abolished in 1864, and from that time every English judge has tried to ascertain the 'laws and usages' of the people as best he could. It is not for me to say how the Hindu law has been administered since the abolition of the learned pundits who assisted the courts with their legal expositions (*Vyvashtas*). But it will be generally admitted that the Hindu community has always occupied a singularly fortunate position in this respect. Works on Hindu law were rendered into English at a very early stage of the British rule; and Hindu judges have presided in the superior courts for a long time past. Unfortunately the Mahomedans have not possessed the same advantages. In Algeria, the French Government, so soon as it acquired the country, set itself to the task of having the most authoritative works on Mahomedan law in force in Northern Africa translated, under official authority, into French. Even the Dutch in Java have pursued the same course. And the translations by Perron and Du Berg are standing monuments, not only of patient industry, but also of deep interest and generosity on the part of the respective Governments.

Of the innumerable works on the law in force among the Indian Mahomedans, only one old recondite treatise, the *Hedaya*, was in, the time of Warren Hastings, translated into English from a Persian rendering. Many of its doctrines, or rather expositions, are long since exploded, for the laws of the Mussulmans have undergone the same process of development as every other system of jurisprudence; and yet they are regarded by non-Moslem writers as binding rules. Mahomedan law, it must not be forgotten, is a vast and difficult

science; to comprehend its principles, it is necessary to have some conception of the rules of exegesis recognised by Mussulman jurists, and to follow its course of development so as to distinguish between the obsolete doctrines and those now in force—for although the primary rules are to be found in the Koran, or in the sayings and the acts of the Arabian Prophet, the grand superstructure of Mussulman jurisprudence is built on the interpretation and expositions of successive jurists and lawyers of acknowledged authority.

Until a few years ago the translation of the *Hedâya* and two or three non-official compilations by men who were not lawyers themselves, formed the sole stock of Mussulman law in the English language. Under such circumstances, with the disappearance of the law officers, the inquiry into Mahomedan law and usages became a task of unusual difficulty, and its principles began to be interpreted with the gloss of English and Hindu laws. How this method of treatment has led to the ruin and disruption of Mahomedan families has already been discussed by me.⁶ Sir Roland Wilson, in his criticism of my remarks on the Mussulman institution of benefactions (*wakfs*) for the support of families, admits that the courts of justice have done 'a wrong' in declaring against the validity of such benefactions, 'though unintentionally and as the result of quite excusable ignorance.' I have never suggested that the mistake which has resulted so disastrously to the Mussulman community was 'intentional'; whether it could have been avoided, or whether the 'ignorance' to which the writer alludes was excusable, are questions I will not enter into. Nor is the period during which this particular rule has been in force relevant to the discussion; if it is the recognised law among the Mussulmans, as my critic admits, the courts of justice are bound under legislative pledges to administer it. As a matter of fact, however, the origin of the rule, by the consensus of Mussulman lawyers from the earliest times, is found in the direct prescription of the Lawgiver of Islâm.

But Sir Roland Wilson has put forward two propositions on which he contends that the suggestion I ventured to make should not be entertained by the Legislature. His first contention amounts to this: as the same rule against perpetuities which has been applied to Mussulman *wakfs* has been dealt out to Hindu entails without any injury to the Hindu community (which is a pure assumption), there is no reason why it should act prejudicially to the Mahomedans. Even if it were assumed, as Sir Roland assumes, that the Hindus have not been injuriously affected by the English rule against perpetuities, two facts, which are absolutely essential to a proper consideration of the matter in relation to the Mahomedans, must be carefully borne in mind: In the first place, the Hindu settlements dealt with in the cases referred to by Sir Roland Wilson were creations of the English system, for in Hindu law, pure and simple, there is no principle

⁶ *Nineteenth Century and After*, October 1905.

analogous to the Mahomedan law respecting family benefactions. And the British courts in deciding against such attempts to create secular perpetuities were not overriding an express rule of Hindu law. In pronouncing against the validity of Mahomedan family trusts, they acted in direct opposition to Mussulman law. In the second place, under the Hindu law, females take no share in the inheritance, or only acquire an interest in the absence of male issue. Under the Mahomedan law women share in the inheritance; and in every case of intestacy the estate of a deceased person is split up among numerous heirs. Again, the Hindu joint family system, which does not prevail among the Mahomedans, is a great preservative of property even after division. Hence the only method of keeping the family together and preventing general pauperisation lay in the strict observance of the rule of *wakf* sanctioned by the Lawgiver.

Sir Roland's second contention is summed up in the question which he propounds in these words: 'Why should the substitution of presumably more efficient for less efficient landowners be described as a process of destruction?' From this passage it is evident that the learned critic has missed my argument; he has, in fact, mixed up two distinct propositions very remotely connected with each other, founded on two different sets of considerations. One related to the expediency of some check on the constant transfer of land in various parts of India, which paralysed all desire of improvement; the other to the necessity of preventing the further destruction of families whose existence was of public benefit, and added to the contentment of the people. In his criticism Sir Roland has involved himself in a long discussion of abstract economic principles, the application of which, even if they were entirely correct, must depend on the circumstances of the country and the condition of the inhabitants. It is impossible for me in the space at my command to traverse the ground of political economy covered by him. I will only observe that in India, as is generally recognised, the legal system, with its somewhat narrow canons of interpretation, affords no stability to the propertied classes, and the feeling of insecurity it engenders supplies no incentive to development or progress. In the public interests I had advocated some legislative measure to protect the landowning classes from the toils of the *mahajan*, who could only by a stretch of imagination be called an 'efficient' landlord. As regards the destruction of *wakf* estates, there is not even that shadow of pretence. They have been brought to the hammer, not because the trustees were 'inefficient,' but because the Courts misunderstood the law. These estates were almost without exception well managed, the tenantry were fairly looked after, the charities were properly administered, and in times of disturbance the State was assisted in the way required.

The principal English journal in Bengal, in its issue of the 7th of February, had some trenchant observations on Sir Roland Wilson's

economic theories. Referring to the question quoted above, it says :

An excellent economic dictum, but one which suggests that Sir Roland Wilson, of Delhi, in spite of his extensive knowledge of Indian law and his publications on Anglo-Mahomedan law, has not a very close acquaintance with the hard facts of agrarian and social conditions in India. If it is in the public interest that important landed families should be dispossessed by 'efficient' money-lenders, it becomes difficult to argue against the proposition that the displacement of millions of peasant proprietors is also a national boon. Anyone who took up this position, however, and endeavoured seriously to maintain it, would find himself in a minority of one among all the writers and thinkers on the land question. Alike from the social and political standpoint is the growth of a helot class deprecated, and Sir Roland Wilson, by his pitiless adherence to the theory of the survival of the fittest, raises grave doubts as to his eligibility to discuss the question from any but a strictly theoretical standpoint.

With regard to the statement that the necessity for legislative action was not felt by the Mussulmans as a body, but was simply my *ipse dixit*, the attitude of the Mahomedans all over Northern India furnishes a conclusive reply. The Central National Mahomedan Association, in its address of welcome to Lord Minto, pointedly referred to the subject as one of the burning questions of the day, the solution of which was vital to Mahomedan prosperity and advancement. In Burmah an association has just been formed for the preservation and protection of Mussulman *wakfs*, which has been incorporated under the Indian Company's Act. In the United Provinces and the Punjab, similar steps are in progress; and the general sentiment, regarding which Sir Roland Wilson entertains philosophic doubts, is expressed in strong and unmistakable words by such leading organs of Mahomedan opinion as the *Observer* and the *Paisa Akhbar* of Lahore.¹

Apart from every other consideration, it would be a mistake, I submit, to neglect the feeling that has been aroused among the Indian Mahomedans by the practical destruction of one of their cherished institutions, with which a great part of their religious and social life is bound up.

But their complaint is not confined to this particular question; they allege, it will be seen presently not without some justification, that the humanity which has been extended to one class of people is denied to them.

In India Christianity and Islam are the only two religions which draw adherents from other creeds, and conversions to the Faith of Mohammed are generally as sincere as to Christianity. In the Hindu

¹ Sir Roland Wilson's reference to the Dead Hand shows that he has failed to grasp the spirit of the law of *wahj*. The Statute of Mortmain was directed against the conveyance of properties to religious uses to the detriment of society, and this gave birth to the present rule against perpetuities. The Mussulman law seeks to prevent the frittering away of individual resources, which constitute national wealth, and aims at the conservation of property in capable hands for public benefit.

system, from which most of the converts are drawn, under no circumstances whatever can the marriage-tie be dissolved in the lifetime of the parties ; there may be the most cogent reasons, physical or moral, for putting an end to the relationship, the law allows no relief in the shape of a divorce or a dissolution of the marriage. However commendable such a view may be from a certain standpoint, in practice it is often disastrous. The wife who abjures her old cult and adopts another faith becomes an absolute outcast ; her presence in the domestic circle is pollution. The husband who keeps to the worship of his ancient gods may not have any relations with her ; if he does, he subjects himself to the same penalties. For the wife there is no release. The hardship of such a rule was appreciated by the British Indian Legislature, and in 1861 an Act ⁸ was passed ' to legalise under certain circumstances the dissolution of marriages of native converts to Christianity.' It provided that when one of the married parties adopted Christianity, and the other on that ground refused conjugal rights, the convert might sue for restitution ; and in case of persistence in the refusal the courts were authorised to dissolve the marriage. The Mahomedans contend that the same humanity should be extended to converts to their Faith. As matters stand at present, the adoption of Mahomedanism involves the greatest risks. Thus the woman who renounces Hinduism for the religion of Mohammed, say from the sincerest conviction, may drag on a degraded existence as an outcast, or lead a life of prostitution ; but she may never obtain a release in life from the tie of marriage. If she contracts a legal union in accordance with her new Faith, she subjects herself to punishment for bigamy, and her Mussulman husband to the penalties of adultery.⁹ If she has issue by her second marriage, the court brands them as bastards.

Missionary activity has begun to introduce into the relations of family life an element of difficulty which is aggravated in the case of Mahomedans by a misreading of their law. The ancient Moslem jurists maintained that when a Mussulman wife abjured Islam and adopted a Scriptural faith like Judaism or Christianity, the marriage became *ipso facto* dissolved.¹⁰ According to the modern jurists whose authority is recognised in India, the marriage remains intact. The British-Indian courts have, it seems, chosen to follow the old doctrine even where the husband⁸ was anxious to maintain the relationship. The unnecessary disruption of domestic peace is naturally regarded as a grievance.

⁸ The Dissolution of Native Converts' Marriages Act (xxi. of 1861).

⁹ The maximum punishment for which is two years' hard labour, with or without fine, which may extend to 1,000 rupees.

¹⁰ This refers to the Sunni sect, to which the bulk of the Mahomedans in India belong.

These are some of the problems which, as they do not lie on the surface, may escape notice in the stress of administration. But their importance is great, as they concern the sentiments of the people towards a foreign rule. A particular question may appear to have a special character as affecting one nationality alone, and yet its consequences may be far-reaching, for the relations of the different civilised nationalities of India are so closely connected that the feelings of one react on the other.

AMEER ALI.

WEATHER AND THE TROUT

THE other day, in casual conversation, an eminent naturalist touched upon the well-known fact that trout never rise freely during the time of languorous atmosphere which precedes a thunderstorm. I myself had thought that the cause of the fish lying low was the lack of oxygen in the water. That, indeed, was one of the few absolute convictions at which I had been able to arrive in studying the phenomena of the sport. I recited an incident that had seemed conclusive warrant for the belief. My statement was that I had been out on a lake catching trout with which to stock a stew-pond ; that by-and-by the fish, as they were gathered into the pail, showed signs of dying, a few of them being turned almost upon their backs ; that then the boatman seized the bailing-pan, filled it, and, holding his hand high, plunged the fresh water into the pail ; and that all the trout immediately began to revive. Was that not clear proof that they had become languid from exhaustion of the oxygen ? Of course, there could never be the same lack of oxygen in lake or stream that there had been in the pail ; but surely the insufficiency in the atmosphere for some time before a thunderstorm, which affected human beings and cattle, would affect trout also ?

My learned friend thoughtfully shook his head. 'Do you know,' he asked, 'how much oxygen a fish needs to keep him alive and comfortable ?'

'I understand that it is not much. Dr. Günther, if I remember rightly, says that the quantity of oxygen that a man needs to keep his blood pure, vitality up to the natural pitch, is fifty thousand times more than suffices for a tench.'

'Doesn't that rather knock your theory on the head ? There would have to be a very great exhaustion of the natural atmosphere before a fish could feel it.'

'I'm not so sure of that,' said I. 'The oxygen we are speaking about is not merely that which is a chemical part of water. It is oxygen drawn from the upper air, mingled with the water. You must bear that in mind. Also you must remember what marvellous effects are produced in human beings by very minute changes in the state of the atmosphere. The essential chemical difference between the

air of Pall Mall and the air of Margate is almost imperceptible ; yet when you go to Margate after being long in London you feel a new man immediately. Nature is a very subtle magician. She gains her effects by means amazingly obscure and minute.'

The naturalist was still unshaken. 'I would,' he said, 'admit your theory to be conceivably correct if it were not that I have one of my own. Yours seems to fall in with the facts all right ; but so does mine. Mine simply is that the reason why trout don't rise freely for an hour or two hours before thunder, or even for a longer time, is that there are then no flies on the water, or very few. Usually there is great heat before a thunderstorm. The heat accelerates the hatching of the insects' eggs ; the flies flutter up, from the bed of the stream and the reeds by the side, prematurely. Thus, before thunder there is a lapse in the orderly rises of fly. Nature, for a short time, is in advance of herself. She has exhausted her stores.'

That was a striking theory. It seemed so reasonable that at first I was disposed to acquiesce ; but a few moments' thought showed that it involved some questionable assertions.

'Are you sure about the insects' eggs ?' I asked. 'I should have imagined that they are bound to hatch out at a definite time after having been laid. Are you sure that the period is lengthened or shortened according to the weather ?'

'I'm not quite sure about the eggs of all the insects,' the naturalist answered. 'There's the March Brown, for example. The eggs of that insect don't seem to be affected by cold, however intense : March Browns always, I think, come out when they are due. But I do believe that in most other cases the hatching-out is retarded by cold. How otherwise can you account for fishermen living away from their streams having to be telegraphed to when the Mayfly is up ? If the weather had nothing to do with the matter, the day of the rising of the Mayfly would be quite regular, just like the coming of Christmas.'

'Yes : that's evident,' I said ; 'but I am still puzzled. Often the period of close warm weather that precedes a thunderstorm is very short—sometimes, indeed, thunder comes without any such warning.'

'When it does the trout are not affected. Thunderstorms are of two kinds. There is the thunder that comes in the middle of a tempest or a gale. That, which is rather rare, is produced by conditions quite different from those which bring about an ordinary thunderstorm. It is not preceded or accompanied by high temperature, and its imminence does not disturb your sport. But the ordinary thunderstorm is undoubtedly, as a rule, the culmination of a protracted process in nature, a process of which the most prominent symptom is close heat. Don't you think it quite likely that this abnormal warmth, which lasts for hours, sometimes even for days, may hasten the hatching of the eggs ?'

'But char rise in sultry weather !'

'I expected you to mention that,' said the naturalist. 'I myself have noticed that char rise in sultry weather. In fact, I've never found them rising freely at any other time. Char, like eels, bestir themselves when there's thunder in the air. But what are they rising at? They take your flies, I know; but I question whether they take any others. I think there are very few others to take. That, in short, is just my point.'

I tried hard to remember the state of nature before an ordinary thunderstorm, and again found cause to think that my friend was in the right. I called to mind the aspects of a lake on which I often fish. In fresh weather the water ripples and sparkles; insects flutter about, especially near the shores; the trout rise merrily the whole day long; all nature is alive and alert. When thunder is coming, the lake, save in patches here and there, where struck by hectic puffs of wind, is still and dull; the sheep and cattle of the fields around are huddled, motionless, in corners; there is no twitter of birds; and there is certainly no fluttering of insects!

Suddenly, however, after feeling that the naturalist was undoubtedly right, I found a new idea suggesting itself. I would use it cautiously, in cross-examining method.

'I understand,' said I, 'that sometimes, when the temperature is abnormally low, the eggs of aquatic insects do really hatch out in due course, but that the young flies, being enfeebled by the cold, die before they reach the surface?'

'That is so,' said my friend. 'It is on such occasions that the wet fly is astonishingly successful even on what are known as dry-fly streams. Feeding on the torpid insects that are being carried downstream below the surface, the trout take sunk artificial flies also.'

'Well, then, as it is certain that a temperature abnormally low prevents a hatching-out of insects' eggs in the complete sense, is it not conceivable that a temperature abnormally high may have the same effect?'

'Dear me! I never thought of that,' the naturalist answered. 'Why, yes: it is conceivable. In fact, it is probable. The development of the eggs may be arrested, and left incomplete, because the water is too warm. But doesn't that come to the same thing as regards why trout don't rise before thunder?'

'Not quite, I think. All living creatures, except the eel and the char, are torpid before the storm—sheep, cattle, bees, and birds——'

'And except salmon,' interjected the naturalist.

'Do salmon rise in sultry weather?'

'O yes: often; but, as salmon certainly do not usually rise at insects, we may leave them out of account.'

'What I was going to say was this: Although, in the general stagnation of nature, most living creatures on the land are dull and

inert before an ordinary thunderstorm, they are not dead or dying. They wake up soon after the storm has burst—whenever the lightning has rectified the atmosphere. Now, may not the immature insects in the water be in the same state—inert before the storm, but lively whenever it has done its work? That would account for the trout rising almost immediately after the first flash—they often do, you know?’

‘Yes: many a fine basket have I made in a thunderstorm.’

‘But here’s a singular thing,’ I went on, as he ruminated happily on the purely sporting aspect of the subject: ‘When the atmosphere is working up to thunder, the trout, which won’t look at artificial flies, won’t look at worms either. Now, what does that show?’

‘You, of course, think it shows that they won’t take anything; but I am not so sure. Perhaps the explanation of their not taking your worm is that there is not at the time any natural supply of worms in the water. Yours may be a solitary apparition, and therefore suspect.’

This astonished me. ‘Do you mean,’ I asked, ‘that the state of the atmosphere which prevents the insects’ eggs from hatching-out properly may also prevent the worms from getting into the stream?’

‘I do,’ said the naturalist. ‘Why not? Apparently you don’t know the worm. He is a very interesting fellow. If you think he has no regular instincts and remarkable habits, that must be because you have never studied him. I will give you a story about worms—true. A friend told me there was a great plague of them in his bowling-green. The turf was covered with their casts, and that made the game very unsatisfactory. He had tried soot and brine; but they would not be killed. “Take me to your bowling-green,” said I; and we went. The whole surface of the lawn was thickly dotted with worm-casts. “What do you think of that?” said he, with a sort of pride at the great extent of his trouble. “O, nothing,” said I. “Within three minutes I could make every worm within a radius of a yard from my feet come up to be captured.” “How?” he asked, astonished. “By a very simple means—incantation. Just turn your back to me, and look round when I cease whistling.” When he had turned I whistled in low tones a weird and melancholy ditty, improvised for the occasion; and when he looked round, lo! it was to see many scores of alarmed worms wriggling on the turf. “So, you see,” I remarked, “it is quite easy to clear your bowling-green without cutting a single sod.” My friend went nearly out of his mind with fright. He was thinking that the Black Arts were no superstition. I had great difficulty in reassuring him. He smiled again only when I had shown him the trick.’

‘What was it?’

The naturalist laughed. ‘You too seem scared rather,’ he said. ‘Compose yourself. As we were passing the tool-house I had picked

up a three-pronged garden fork, which I carried to the lawn in an innocent, careless manner. 'When my friend had turned I pushed the fork into the turf, and while whistling I moved the implement quickly to and fro, gently shaking the soil. When all the worms had come up, I pulled the fork out, and obliterated, with pressure from my boot, the marks that the prongs had made.'

The naturalist was so much delighted over his recollection of the affair that he was forgetting our argument.

'Well?' I said.

'Ah!' he answered, bringing his mind back to our subject. 'Don't you see that worms are exceedingly sensitive?'

'They came up because of the tremor in the soil,' I answered; 'but that was not a small thing. It must have seemed an earthquake to the worms. We need not consider them exceedingly sensitive merely because they are alarmed by violence.'

'No,' said my friend; 'but it is an extreme case I have been citing. If a small bird played a tattoo with its bill upon a lawn, you would not call that violence—would you?'

I admitted that I should not.

'Well,' the naturalist went on, 'thrushes, blackbirds, and starlings can do with their beaks what I did with the garden fork. You will see them doing it if you watch. They alight where they think the worms may be, dab at the ground quickly, and then, cocking their heads on one side, look at the place eagerly—listening, too, I think. If a worm doesn't come up, they conclude that there is none there, and hop off to try elsewhere.'

'Do the worms respond to the tapping?'

'O, yes: they come up, and are gobbled by the birds. Now, what I ask you to consider is this: Worms being so nervous that they rush out of the earth when they feel the very minute tremor caused by the tapping of a little bird's bill, is it not easily conceivable that during the period of stillness which usually precedes thunder there may be at work some influence of Nature to keep them down?'

'Easily,' I answered, much struck. 'And, of course, if a stream is not getting its usual supply of worms, the trout will probably be disinclined to look at the solitary ones thrown in by anglers. That is what you mean, I think?'

'Exactly. Although we must be very wary in dogmatising about the ways of the trout, it is undoubtedly a fact that they hardly ever show much interest in what the angler offers unless Nature is at the same time providing supplies of the same thing—or the thing of which the lure is an imitation. And it is quite possible, I imagine, that during the dull time in which the atmosphere is fermenting towards an outburst the worms inhabiting the banks of a stream, instead of being on or near the surface and liable to drop down or to be washed down, have gone far in.'

I acknowledged this possibility, and mentioned what a little time before had been passing through my mind, that in the still time before thunder birds and insects are silent, and cattle huddled into corners.

'That is so,' said the naturalist; 'but there is more than that. The cattle have ceased to graze! Have you noticed that?'

'I think I have,' I answered, after reflecting; 'but the fact seems to throw a new light on the fishing problem. It is not for want of fodder that the cattle have ceased to graze. The pasture is still there, and surely as good as ever.'

I felt this to be an unanswerable remark; but the naturalist laughed.

'Yes,' he said, 'the pasture is still there; but I don't think you should be sure that it is as good as ever. Growing flowers give off carbonic acid gas in the night, you know; which is why they should not be kept in your house then; and I think that in the pre-thunder state of atmosphere they may give it off also during the day, which might account for the cattle ceasing to eat the grass.'

'Perhaps; but don't you think that a more natural theory is this: that the peculiar state of the atmosphere has a similar effect on all living things, making them inactive and putting them off their food; and that the trout having ceased to take may be due, not to the absence of flies and worms and grubs, though indeed all these may be absent, but simply to the direct effect which the peculiar state of the atmosphere has on the trout themselves?'

'That is just the question,' said he. 'There's something to be said for both sides.'

'On my side, if I may so call it for the sake of regulating the argument, there is to be said that fish under the pre-thunder influence do not show the same uniformity of conduct that is manifest among the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the insects. The char and the eel are ravenous under the influence, and you have told me that the salmon is not affected. May this be held to indicate that the pre-thunder influence is not so potent among the creatures in the water as it is among the creatures above?'

'It might,' said the naturalist; 'but that would get us no further forward. It would only show that the char and the eel revel in atmosphere highly charged with electricity. The salmon, I think, is in a different case. He finds the greater part of his sustenance not in the river but in the sea. When he leaves the sea he is so highly nourished, so fat, that he can live in the river, even if he finds no food there, for many months. Some say that when he rises at an artificial fly, or takes a minnow, he is only amusing himself, or giving way to irritation. Well, then, it may be that, being exuberant in vitality from his feasting in the sea, he is not so readily affected by the enervating atmosphere as the trout is.'

'Ah! "Enervating atmosphere!" Is not that a concession? If the pre-thunder atmosphere is enervating to the trout, other

phenomena, such as the absence of flies and the possible absence of worms, though very interesting in themselves, are apart from the problem. That the trout are enervated would sufficiently explain why they don't rise at our flies or seize the worm.'

'You may be right,' said the naturalist, laughing. 'Indeed, I am inclined to believe you are. I stated the alternative theory mainly because there is a good deal to be said for it. Either theory seems to be as cogent as the other. Trout-fishing brings up questions of natural science that are very subtle.'

'What others are there?'

'O, many. There's the wind, for example. What has our fishermen's folk-lore to say on that subject? It says that there is little or no hope of sport when the wind is from any point between north and east. Now, that is wrong, I think; or, rather, it is not quite right. There are waters on which northerly or easterly breezes are actually the best. These breezes are the best on all waters near the north coast or the east coast—the north wind on the north coast, and the east on the east. That, I think, is because during daytime, when the land is warmer than the sea, conducting the sun's heat more quickly, they are the normal winds on these waters. Besides, northerly or easterly winds are not always bad even on waters elsewhere. Mr. Francis Francis records that one of his best baskets was made in the south-west country in a high north wind, and there are many other testimonies to the same effect. Still, it remains a fact that, away from the north coast and the east, north winds and east winds seem adverse as a rule. How would you account for that?'

'Perhaps it is because northerly and easterly winds, being cold, interfere with the hatching-out of the insects?'

'That may be; but I do not think so. Often, in northerly or easterly winds, although the trout are not rising, there are plenty of flies about. You must have noticed that. Therefore, the inactivity of the trout can hardly be a question of temperature. What is the alternative?'

'Atmospherical pressure?'

'That's it, I think. Over nearly the whole surface of the British Islands the prevailing winds are from the south-west. Wind from any point between north and east often denotes a disturbance in the atmosphere. Often, at any rate during the early stages of the breeze, the mercury in the barometer is falling.'

I ventured to remark that it sometimes fell when the wind was from the west or from the south.

'And when it does fall in such a wind,' said the naturalist, 'the same thing happens. The trout go down. Think. Have you not often been out on stream or lake on a day of this kind—light, sparkling, breezy weather in the earlier hours, probably until a little

past two o'clock, with good sport all the time ; and a gradual gathering of cloud, with a drop in the wind, in the afternoon, and fishes becoming fewer and fewer, until they stopped altogether ?'

On reflection I had to admit that the experience was not unfamiliar.

'Observe carefully' henceforth,' said the naturalist, 'and you will find that when the weather follows the course we have sketched the trout invariably become inactive. That kind of afternoon languor should be, though it hardly ever is, recognised by the fisherman as being just as bad a portent as a wind from the north or from the east.'

'But you said, a few minutes ago, that splendid baskets are sometimes made in the winds which the fisherman's folk-lore regards as adverse.'

'Yes,' answered the naturalist ; 'and that is just what I was coming to. I think I can explain why we are now and then fortunate in these winds. Not every wind from the north or from the east is the same thing as every other wind from the north or from the east. The wind, not less as regards its direction than as regards its temperature, is often deceptive. There is a state of the weather, occurring frequently, in which the wind, whatever its direction, and however considerable its force, is not a true wind—the anti-cyclonic state, which is accompanied by brightness and frost in winter and brightness and drought in summer—the state that comes about when we are within what is known as an area of high pressure, over which, in a very real sense, "the wind bloweth where it listeth." Although a breeze then is coming from the north, it is not necessarily coming from the Polar Circle. It is only a local current ; perhaps its course is not longer than three or four miles. At such a time, if the mercury, which is high, is not falling, the trout often rise freely ; if it is still rising they are sure to be doing so. Besides, there is a time during which a wind from a northerly quarter—west-north-west—is the very best omen you can have. That is when a depression in the atmosphere, the condition of storm, is passing off. Then the mercury in the barometer is rising, and so are the trout—invariably. The northerly or easterly wind under which they subside is that which comes with a depression. They tend to go down also when the wind denoting depression comes from the west or from the south-west ; but they go down more reluctantly then, and that I attribute to the south-west wind being our prevailing wind.'

'You mean, in short, that it is neither the direction nor the temperature of the wind that affects the trout, but the atmospherical pressure ?'

'Quite so.'

'And that the trout, as it were, like high pressure, and dislike low pressure ?'

'Not exactly that,' said the naturalist. 'Often they come on

well when the pressure is very low. That is when the storm-centre has passed and the mercury is beginning to rise. That is the only time when you can count upon sport as being certain—the time during which, after a storm, the mercury is creeping up. Often they are reluctant when it is high and stationary. I am speaking, you understand, of the daytime. About sundown, for an hour or more, trout almost always rise from the beginning of May until the end of August; they do so, I imagine, because, whatever the weather may be, they must feed at some time in the round of the clock, and some instinct makes them choose the evening. But daytime is the ordinary time for the ordinary fisherman; and I believe I am right in saying that then, although a trout or two may usually be caught, a heavy basket is certain only within twenty-four hours after the passing of the storm-centre.'

'A heavy basket, then, must be very rare!'

'Of course!' answered the naturalist, looking astonished. 'Haven't you found it so?'

I cast my mind back over a few seasons, and found that he was right. A trout or two are always possible; but the memorably good day is very unusual, and it is always in immediate succession to a storm.

This rumination having been stated in words, the naturalist was much amused.

'Ho!' said he, 'there's nothing wonderful in that. What is a storm? It is a clearance, a refreshing, of the atmosphere. Between storms the atmosphere constantly tends towards decay. Most sentient things become sluggish. Immediately after a storm, cattle, birds, insects, and human beings feel revived, and act accordingly. So do the trout. If it were not for the eel and the char, among *fauna*, and the fungi among *flora*, I would say that in this respect all living things are uniform in their habits and impulses. Notwithstanding the exceptions, I think that is broadly the case. "Nature," a philosopher declares, "is more simple than our conception thereof: we begin with very complicated theories, and end with the most simple." That is a wise remark, I think.'

W. EARL HODGSON.

THE SACRED FIRE OF ISRAEL

IN reading some modern commentaries on the Old Testament we are struck by the fact that, in spite of profound scholarship and a criticism of the mass of historical events and records lately come to light, used with a freedom which sometimes takes our breath away, yet very little attention is paid to explaining, as founded on natural or physical causes, narratives of events usually regarded as miraculous when these are unusual or rare, and prove to be of punitive or beneficially providential value. The aforesaid works are mostly written for the use of pastors, preachers, or teachers, and the explanation of narratives of miraculous events in the Old Testament, as unusual natural or physical phenomena, has never met with much acceptance from them, for the following reasons. In the first place, pastors are not so well equipped by their education for judging whether the explanation is sound or not, as they are of literary or historical criticism; then those who make the suggestions are generally scientific men or travellers, having little sympathy for the difficulties of the pastor, who finds such explanations disturb the faith of his congregation, sometimes with disastrous results.

Hugh Miller rather humorously describes the difference between the scientific and the scholarly critic by supposing the former to be a wolf, who peers into a hut where some shepherds are dining off a leg of mutton. 'Ah!' says he, 'what an outcry would these men have made had they found me doing such a thing!' which hits the point very well; it was because he was a wolf that the shepherds objected. *They* had cared for the flock and had a right to live off it; but *he* had not.

At the present day most pious persons attribute unusual providential occurrences to an overruling supernatural power, so that we may be sure the Israelites of old did so; nor would it be necessary to point this out but that, in accordance with the theological ideas of the times, some of the Scripture narratives misdescribe the events. In consequence of this, the tracing of an unusual natural or physical phenomenon, described in the Old Testament as miraculous, instead of being a destructive criticism may prove of a highly constructive

character, showing that the story was founded on fact, instead of being a pure invention or allegory.

For instance, when the 'Ark of the Lord,' after being captured by the Philistines, is allowed to return, it is related that it stopped at Beth-Shemesh; and because the men of that place looked into it, the 'Lord smote' more than 'fifty thousand with a great slaughter.'¹ But as the ark had just come from plague-stricken cities, it brought the infection with it. Now as the object of the writer was to restore the prestige of the ark, which had suffered from its capture by the Philistines, if he had been inventing the tale he would not have told it with circumstances bearing such an easy interpretation. The explanation, therefore, though seemingly destructive, really strengthens the story as founded on fact, and is at the same time more in accordance with our present conceptions of God.

The priests of several nations have used fire got directly from the sun, which, according to Old Testament diction, is bringing it down from heaven, to impress the worshippers of their religions with the sacred character of their sacrifices.

The practice was found by the Spaniards amongst the Peruvians when they first conquered them:

A fire was kindled by means of a concave mirror of polished metal which, collecting the rays of the sun into a focus upon a quantity of dried cotton, speedily set it on fire. It was the expedient on like occasions in Ancient Rome, at least under the reign of the pious Numa. When the sky was overcast and the face of the good Deity was hidden, which was esteemed a bad omen, fire was obtained by means of friction.²

Professor Drummond gives a modern instance of how impressive on uneducated minds such a proceeding is. The natives of the Nyassa Tanganyika plateau greatly admired his possessions, but

the greatest wonder of all, perhaps, was the burning glass. They had never seen glass before, and thought it was 'mazi' or water, but why the mazi did not run over when I put it in my pocket passed all understanding. When the light focussed on the dry grass set it ablaze their terror knew no bounds. 'He is a mighty spirit,' they cried, 'and brings down fire from the sun.' I asked my men one day the question point blank: 'Why do you not kill me and take my guns and clothes and beads?' 'Oh!' they replied, 'we would never kill a spirit.'³

The following quotation, showing that the fire from the sun was used in ancient Persia for religious purposes, is from *Bibby's Quarterly*:

Many thousand years before Moses led the Children of Israel across the Red Sea, the first of the great teachers known by this name (Zoroaster) emigrated with the Iranian people, a branch of the primitive Aryan family, from the cradle-land of the race into the vast territory now known as modern Persia.

¹ I. Samuel vi. 19.

² Prescott's *Hist. of Conquest of Peru*, vol. i. p. 99.

³ *Tropical Africa*, p. 104.

According to their Scriptures the original Zoroaster had the power to call down fire from heaven after the manner of Elijah at Mount Carmel. As Zoroaster spake there was no fire at the altar at his side. There was sandal-wood in fragrant heaps, there were perfumes, but no fire. But as he spake he held a rod pointing towards heaven, and in response to the compelling mattress the living fire wreathed round him, and made him a man of flame as he spake the words of the fire and proclaimed the everlasting truth, and as he spake some of the fire darted downwards and fired the altar at his side.

According to their Scriptures, new altar fires were always lit in this way for centuries after Zoroaster's time.

The following passage from the *Zend Avesta* evidently refers to the same religious function :

And those means of grace, although abounding in the inculcation of moral sanctity in thought, word, and deed, are yet profane, aside from that holy fire which rallied the masses to the national worship.*

Before taking into consideration the question of whether this Persian sacred fire was of the same nature as that used by the Israelites, it will be well to read a description, a little condensed, of a fire used by the Greeks in war during the early centuries of the Christian era :

The Greek fire was composed of naphtha or liquid bitumen, a light tenacious and inflammable oil which catches fire as soon as it comes into contact with the air. The naphtha was mingled with sulphur and pitch of fir. It produced a thick smoke and loud explosion, and was nourished by water instead of being extinguished by it. The composition of this fire was kept secret with jealous care at Constantinople, and the Greeks said that it had been revealed by an angel to Constantine.

There seems no reason to call in question this account of Gibbon. It is very similar in description to the Persian sacred fire already quoted, and, as we shall presently see, still more so to that of the Israelites. It appears in a nation in intimate intercourse with both Jews and Persians, and the origin is supposed to be supernatural, so that we may fairly say that it is a probable explanation. If some Jewish or Persian priest, a convert to Christianity, imparted the secret of its composition to Constantine, the whole matter becomes clear enough.

The first mention in the Bible of the holy fire, or 'fire of the Lord,' which is sufficiently circumstantially described to attract our attention, is that accompanying Moses in his wanderings with the Children of Israel after leaving Egypt. Here we are at once met by a vivid account, almost exactly corresponding with Gibbon's description, of the Greek fire.

Moses used this fire in large quantities, which we must suppose he made himself, having learnt the method of preparation from the Egyptian priests whilst being educated amongst them.

In order to consider the Pentateuchal account fairly, we will, for

* Max Muller's *Translation of the Zend Avesta*, vol. iv. p. 95.

* Gibbon's *Roman Hist.* chap. lii.

the time, eliminate or mitigate the priestly remarks attributing Divine intention or direction to the fire, in the same way that whilst a coroner directs a jury that the person died by 'the act of God,' the medical witness says it was from 'sudden failure of the heart,' both describing the same fact.

The first thing worth mentioning is an angel or pillar of cloud going before Israel, which removed and intervened between them and the pursuing Egyptians, and seems to have checked the latter. This account supports the idea that Moses got the fire from the Egyptian priests, because, if the Egyptian soldiers recognised in the pillar of cloud, or, as we may read, smoke, something like what they were accustomed to associate with their own worship, it would be likely to restrain them.

The description would be realised if we suppose a large petroleum lamp to have been used, the flame being surrounded by a circular brass plate shield for safety, which would prevent the flame being seen.⁶

In still weather the dense smoke would ascend as a pillar to some height, and then, spreading out, form that cloud described later on as resting over the tent of the Tabernacle; whilst the reflection on the smoke from the flame below would make it appear at night a pillar of light.

At the inauguration of the first sacrifice since the Exodus by Moses and Aaron, we are told that⁷ 'there came a fire out from before the Lord and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering.' And we may notice that the cloud or smoke was so dense that Moses could not enter into the tent of the Tabernacle, a circumstance repeated at the dedication of the Temple by Solomon. This was apparently the first time the sacred naphtha was used among the Israelites, and it had an immediately impressive effect, almost identical with that mentioned by the *Zend Avesta* as occurring in Persia on a like occasion. 'When all the people saw it they shouted and fell on their faces.'⁸

We have seen that the Persians associated sweet smells with their sacrifices, 'sandal wood in fragrant heaps and perfumes.' In like manner perfumes were associated with the religious sacrifices of the Israelites.

The ordinary lamps of the sanctuary were to be supplied with pure olive oil; then there was a holy anointing oil for the priests, of myrrh, cinnamon, cassia, and sweet calamus, with olive oil,⁹ as well as a more powerfully smelling incense, 'stacte and onycha and galbanum, sweet spices with pure frankincense,' one object of these perfumes,

* 'Behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces.' - Gen. xv. 17. Abraham's vision will hardly admit any other explanation as the text stands; but if for 'pieces' we read *parties*, it is clearer.

⁷ Exodus xl. and Numbers ix.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Exodus xxx. 23, 24, 35, 38.

both among the Persians and Israelites, being to cover the oppressive smell which animal sacrifice otherwise must always entail.

But of the composition of the 'fire of the Lord' no hint whatever is given. It was apparently considered too dreadful and sacred a secret to be committed to writing, and we must suppose that it was handed down orally in those directions to the priests for the ceremonial of their religion, which the Jews have always tenaciously maintained to have proceeded in unbroken tradition from the time of Moses downward.

As we might expect with such a dangerous combustible, some terrible events now happened, two of which in modern phraseology we should call accidents.

Soon after the initiation of the burnt-offerings by Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, the eldest sons of Aaron,

took each of them his censer and put fire therein, and laid incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord which he had not commanded them. And there came forth a fire from the Lord and devoured them, and they died before the Lord.¹⁰

Probably they had taken some of the sacred naphtha and put it in their censers, and anointed themselves with it as well, in order to give themselves, as they thought, greater sanctity.

They had done wrong, no doubt, but it was the same sort of wrong that a careless or foolhardy workman in a powder manufactory does if he goes into a dangerous room with iron nails in his boots, by a spark from which he is blown up.

Moses, as might be expected, is dreadfully alarmed. He orders the dead bodies to be immediately removed, and commands Aaron and his other two sons not to move. 'Let not a hair of your heads go loose, neither rend your clothes, that ye die not . . . and ye shall not go out from the door of the tent of meeting lest ye die, for the anointing oil of the Lord is upon you.'¹¹ From which words of Moses it is evident that an accident had occurred, and that it was not done intentionally.

The next outbreak of the fire also was probably not intentional. It is indeed attributed to the people's murmuring; but that they were always doing, and it reads as if some receptacle or barrel containing the sacred naphtha had been accidentally upset, and the fluid, running along the ground, had caught fire in some of the nearest outlying tents of the camp. 'And the fire of the Lord burnt among them, and devoured in the uttermost part of the camp.'¹²

Then there was a conspiracy by Korah, Dathan, and Abiram to overthrow the authority of Moses and Aaron; and Moses, who wants

¹⁰ Leviticus x. 1.

¹¹ *Ibid.* x.

¹² Numbers xi. 1.

a little time for preparation, appoints the next day for a trial as to who was really chosen of the Lord.

At the appointed time and place the two opposing parties assembled, putting us in mind of Elijah's struggle with the prophets of Baal at a later date. Moses warns all the congregation to stand away from the rebels, so as to be out of danger, and then happens what we read as an explosion. The ground opened under them, and some went down into the pit. 'And there came out a fire from the Lord and consumed two hundred and fifty men of them.'¹³ Gibbon speaks of the Greek fire as being explosive, and many inflammable chemicals burning as a combustible in the open are explosive if confined.

After the quelling the sedition which arose from the punishment of Korah and his followers, we hear no more of the fire of the Lord for a long time. Nor till the time of Elijah is there any account of its being used in a manner destructive to life. Either it fell into disuse in the time of Joshua, or the priests had overcome the difficulties attending the use of it, and its occasional exhibition did not attract much attention; whilst the odium which attended the punishment of Korah with it prevented any similar execution of that sort.

Passing the story of Manoah's angel, on which we need not dwell, the next time we meet with the 'fire of the Lord' is in 1 Chronicles xxi. 26, when David is offering a burnt-offering on the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite in order to stop a plague. He 'called upon the name of the Lord, and he answered him from heaven by fire upon the altar.'

The occasion was a very important one, and some of the naphtha might have been brought from Jerusalem by a priest, in a barrel especially constructed for the purpose.

In the inauguration of Solomon's Temple the fire again falls from heaven upon the altar, and the cloud fills the House of the Lord.

To account for all the points in the story of Elijah, to which we now come, a little liberty of conjecture will be used, going beyond what is actually told in the text, though still keeping within the bounds of circumstantial evidence.

I think it will be clear, before we reach the end of this article, that Elijah did use the sacred naphtha, and some persons feel as if this were a charge against his *bona fides*. But if there is one thing plainer than another, it is that a more resolute, straightforward man than Elijah never existed. Some charge of over-zeal may be made against him, but surely none of underhand dealing.

Those who think orthodoxy requires them to believe that the miracle was done contrary to, and in direct breach of natural laws, must allow that the miracle was urgently required by the conditions of the northern kingdom of Israel, fast drifting to ruin by its idol-worship. They must also admit that it was eminently successful,

¹³ Numbers xvi.

and probably postponed the fall of the nation for a hundred and fifty years or so. If, then, the miracle could be done in accordance with natural laws, how can it be said that Elijah was not justified in using the means at his command?

There is no reason to suppose that he was not as firmly convinced that the naphtha was a Divine means of calling down fire from heaven if it were the will of God, as he was that the burnt-offerings made by the priests at Jerusalem called down a blessing from heaven.

That its composition was kept secret, whilst that of the incense and anointing oil of the priests was published, was because of its dangerous character.

How did Elijah procure his supply of the naphtha? Between his flying from Ahab to hide by the brook Cherith, and afterwards with the widow at Zarephath, until the performance of the miracle, more than two years elapsed, so that he had plenty of time for getting it, and as Jerusalem possessed it thence he probably obtained a supply.

In those years of distress and anxiety of mind, with the burden of his nation's danger pressing heavily upon him, where should he look for advice or help except to the priests at Jerusalem, where the only true worship of God was still maintained?

To Jerusalem, therefore, he probably secretly went to worship, and when there asked counsel of the priests, who would have several incentives to help him. Besides the religious one of wishing to reclaim their erring brethren from idolatry would be the political one, that if the northern kingdom returned to the religion of Jehovah reunion might be possible, or at any rate it would be more likely to remain friendly to them.

They would show Elijah in the Pentateuch, if he were not already acquainted with it, how Moses, under like circumstances, kept the people to the true religion, and when they offered him some of the sacred naphtha it is difficult to see why he should not feel justified by Moses's authority both in using it and keeping it secret.

No doubt minute directions for its use would accompany the naphtha, of which we will suppose that four small barrels were given him, and these enclosed, for greater safety, in four larger barrels.¹¹ This number is indicated as Elijah used four empty barrels at the miracle, and there were four manifestations of the fire.

These barrels Elijah must have had secretly conveyed to the northern kingdom and hidden in different places, probably buried or placed in caves, one full barrel and the four empty ones being placed at Mount Carmel.

When the challenge to the priests of Baal was given, and the people in their thousands gathered round, Elijah allows the priests

¹¹ Carbide of calcium is dangerously explosive if it comes into contact with water; in consequence of which it is sent out in iron drums, inclosed in wooden cases for greater safety, so that the proceeding is evidently quite reasonable.

of Baal the first trial until noon, when he begins to build an altar to the Lord and prepares the sacrifice. It reads as if he did it all himself, but at any rate he had attendants at his bidding, as the subsequent proceedings show. Around the altar he digs a trench capable of holding 'two measures of seed,' to confine the naphtha from running out dangerously amongst the people when he should call them to come near. This took Elijah till about the time of the evening sacrifice, which Josephus tells us was half-way between noon and sunset, when the sun would still be shining in full force. In summer this would give Elijah about four hours to do his work.

When all was ready water is poured over all to show that there was no concealed fire, but it was not measures which were used for the purpose, but four empty barrels which were already there, with a fifth full of the naphtha probably as well. Measures, as being open, and usually used for such purposes, would have been more convenient, but barrels are especially designed for carrying fluids about in, and are rarely mentioned in Scripture, wine being generally conveyed in skins and oil in jars, neither of which would have been suitable for naphtha; therefore the presence of barrels here is worth noting.

The barrels are filled with water in the sight of the people and poured over the altar again and again in the eye of the sun; the last, as we must suppose, being the barrel of naphtha.

Then Elijah prayed, and a very sincere prayer we may be sure it was. The future of his nation as well as his own life were at stake—would the answering fire come or not? The flame bursts forth and we have Elijah's triumph; and immediately, as with Moses and Zoroaster, and in a lesser degree we may add with Drummond, on like occasions, we have the simultaneous conviction of the people, and the shout arises: 'The Lord, he is the God; the Lord, he is the God.' The naphtha, being lighter than water, would float on the top in the trench and account for the fire licking up the water therein.

The use Elijah made of the three remaining vessels of naphtha is desperate reading, and we may be excused for passing on. Probably the impression left by it placed an odium on the use of the sacred fire like that which happened after the punishment of Korah's rebellion with it by Moses; at any rate, it is doubtful if there is any reference to it after this in the Old Testament canon.

There is a slight indication of the knowledge of an explosive combustible in one of the apocryphal stories of Daniel, after which comes the account in the second book of Maccabees, but this so lucidly clears up the whole matter that we will postpone its consideration until the last.

Passing this, then, for the present, the next evidence of any manipulation of the fire is given by Josephus, which fairly shows that the priesthood in his time kept a stock of the naphtha, probably in the cellars under the Temple; its use, however, in the Temple fires and

sacrifices having become so regular, or at any rate periodical, as not to attract or require particular notice.

Josephus tells us that Herod, hearing that Hyrcanus had found a treasure in King David's sepulchre, goes to see if he can find some more, but

as for any money he found none, as Hyrcanus had done, but that furniture of gold and those precious goods that were laid up there, all which he took away. However, he had a great desire to make a more diligent search, and to go farther in, even as far as the very bodies of David and Solomon, where two of his guards were slain by a flame that burst out upon those that went in, as the report was. So he was terribly affrighted, and went out and built a propitiatory monument of that fright he had been in.¹⁵

It has been suggested that this fire was a bituminous gas exhaling from the earth, which had accumulated in the tomb like fire-damp does in coal mines, and, *route de mieux*, this explanation might be worth considering, but as the matter stands is quite unnecessary.

The priests of Jerusalem had the custody of this tomb, which had been opened occasionally for centuries without any such fire being noticed. It had been visited at least twice not long before, once by the priests or Maccabees to hide the treasure there, and once by Hyrcanus when he plundered it. Herod went at night by torchlight, and not finding any money at first rummaged further, where he saw some barrels of naphtha, and, one of these being broken open in search of money, the explosion occurred. Had there been any strong leak of gas in this corner of the tomb the whole chamber would have been full of it, and the explosion have occurred at once on entrance being made; and, besides this, the thing would have been previously well known.

Except the Temple itself, there could be no place so likely for the priests to store the naphtha as with their other treasures, in the sepulchre of King David, and it is very likely that at this time the cellars of the Temple were not quite finished, or were not considered safe from sacrilegious ransacking; and this view is entirely corroborated by the latest evidence we have of the existence of this fire in connection with the Temple of Jerusalem.

It is thus told by Graetz in his *History of the Jews* :

So hardly did Christian Rome now deal with the Jews that the advent of Julian the Apostate, who tried to reinstate the old worship of Rome, A.D. 361, was a period of great relief. There was even some movement towards rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem. But while the workmen were engaged in clearing away the ruin, volumes of fire burst forth from the subterranean vaults, and this was supposed to be such a signal mark of God's displeasure that the workmen were seized with a panic and the work was discontinued, never to be resumed.

Now, how can we explain this account except by supposing that the workmen burst into a store of the sacred naphtha, when perhaps

¹⁵ *Antiquities*, Book xvi. c. vii.

the spark from a workman's tool set it alight? Any suggestion of petroleum gas is even more unlikely than in the case of David's sepulchre. The cellars of the Temple had been long in use, and any such escape would have been well known. And we may also remark that both in this outbreak of the fire, as well as that at King David's sepulchre, the impression at once conveyed was that it was of Divine origin.

This account of the outbreak of the fire in the cellars of the Temple brings us to a time overlapping that when Constantine is said to have had the composition of the Greek fire revealed to him by an angel, and is the last incident we have connecting this sort of fire in any way with the worship or Temple of the Jews.

We will now go back and consider the account given in the second of Maccabees.

This work is allowed to have been written between the years 140 and 60 B.C., and, although somewhat loosely composed in parts, is good evidence on such a subject as this.

We gather that Judas Maccabeus and the Council at Jerusalem inform the Alexandrian Jews that they are about to cleanse the altar at Jerusalem and renew the sacrifices with some sacred '*Naphthar*' which has been handed down to them by '*Neemias*.'

Therefore whereas we are now purposed to keep the purification of the Temple upon the five-and-twentieth day of the month Casleu, we thought it necessary to certify you thereof, that ye also might keep it as the feast of the tabernacles, and of the fire which was given us when *Neemias* offered sacrifice after that he had builded the Temple and the altar. For when our fathers were led into Persia the priests that were then devout took fire of the altar privily, and hid it in an hollow place of a pit without water, where they kept it sure, so that the place was unknown to all men. Now, after many years, when it pleased God. *Neemias*, being sent from the King of Persia, did send of the posterity of those priests that had hid it to the fire, but when they told us they found no fire but thick water then commanded he them to draw it up and to bring it, and when the sacrifices were laid on *Neemias* commanded the priests to sprinkle the wood and the things laid thereupon with the water. When this was done, and the time came that the sun shone, which aforetime was hid in a cloud, there was a great fire kindled, so that every man marvelled. And the priests made a prayer Whilst the sacrifice was consuming, I say both the priests, and all the rest answering thereto as *Neemias* did. . . . Now when the sacrifice was consumed *Neemias* commanded the water that was left to be poured on the stones. When this was done there was kindled a flame, but it was consumed by the light that shined from the altar. So when this matter was known it was told the King of Persia that in the place where the priests that were led away had hid the fire there appeared water, and that *Neemias* had purified the sacrifices therewith. Then the King inclosing the place made it holy, after that he had tried the matter. . . . And *Neemias* called this thing *Naphthar*, which is as much as to say a cleansing, but many men call it *Nephi*. It is found in the records that *Jeromy* the prophet commanded them that were carried away to take of the fire as it hath been signified. . . . Then shall the Lord show them these things, and the glory of the Lord shall appear, and the cloud also as it was showed unto *Moses*, and as when *Solomon* desired that the place might be honourably sanctified . . . and as when

Moses prayed unto the Lord, the fire came down from heaven and consumed the sacrifice, even so prayed Solomon also, and the fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt-offerings. . . . *Whereas we then are about to celebrate the purification*, we have written unto you and ye shall do well if ye keep the same days.¹⁸

This account has met with little attention from commentators, who sometimes even stigmatise the letter as an impudent forgery, for no other reason that I can see but that the account of the 'Naphthar' is considered 'wildly improbable'; but, as we have seen, so far is this from being the case that it is, on the contrary, more than probable, which sets the subject in another aspect.

On general grounds nothing could be more likely than that such a letter was written, for as we learn from the first book of Maccabees, which is by a different author and much better writer, who goes over the same time, that as soon as the Maccabees had established a Jewish government at Jerusalem they sent ambassadors with letters to make alliances with the Lacedemonians and Romans, in order to strengthen themselves; therefore it is quite in accordance with what we might expect that Judas Maccabeus should have sent such a letter to the Alexandrian Jews, an important and growing community, who not long afterwards built themselves an independent temple in Egypt.

It is true that this letter makes references to passages in Jeremiah and Nehemiah which we do not find in our version of the Old Testament. But this has been edited over and over again, and these parts may have been omitted as too explicit, or, what is quite as likely, the passages may have been taken from some other books attributed to Jeremiah and Nehemiah at this time, but which subsequent examination did not prove of sufficient value or authenticity to be included in the canon when this was finally fixed. The references in the letter to the manifestations of the fire in connection with Moses and Solomon are quite correct, and it would be hardly likely that so reputable a writer as the author of the second of Maccabees would have invented the letter entirely, as the commentators allege, and have made false references in it to well-known works which must have exposed him to instant detection.

But even if the letter is a pure invention it is still perfectly good evidence that the author knew of the 'Naphthar' and its properties about one hundred years B.C. Robinson Crusoe is confessedly fictitious, but would still prove, if necessary, that Defoe knew of the properties of guns and gunpowder.

But there is one point which tends to prove that the letter is genuine, as it shows that it must have been written before that twenty-fifth of Casleu when the fire was to be used to purify the altar. In this case, the only one recorded, the 'Naphthar' failed to bring down the fire as expected, and we cannot conceive that an author would invent

¹⁸ II. Maccabees i. 18 *et seq.*

such a long explanation of its power to bring down fire from heaven, which he already knew to have been a failure in this respect, whilst at the same time he might feel it his duty to give the letter if, as historian, he had access to such a valuable original document.

This is the account in the tenth chapter of the second of Maccabees :

Now Maccabeus and his company, the Lord guiding them, recovered the Temple and the city . . . and having cleansed the Temple they made another altar, and *striking stones they took fire out of them*, and offered a sacrifice after two years and set forth the incense and lights and shewbread. . . . Now upon the same day that the stranger profaned the Temple, on the very same day it was cleansed again, even the *five-and-twentieth day of the same month, which is Casleu*.

Now the reason the fire did not fall from heaven as expected is explained by the date, the 25th day of Casleu, that is, December 14. It was winter, and the sun was either overcast or had not sufficient power to ignite the naphtha; so, like the Peruvians, as previously quoted from Prescott under like circumstances, they got fire by friction, 'by striking two stones.'

To conclude, the evidence is circumstantial, cumulative, positive, and, one would think, sufficient to prove that the prophets and priests of Israel used a highly inflammable fluid, probably a preparation of refined petroleum, to bring down fire from heaven, at least occasionally; and although not acceptable to conservative theologians, to others, I am sure, must be a great relief.

F. H. BALKWILL.

REMINISCENCES OF THE ILLUSTRÉ THÉÂTRE

THE association of comedians known as the Illustre Théâtre (at first a society of amateurs) had in its early days a precarious existence, and for some years was without a fixed domicile. The *salle de théâtre* at Paris, set up originally by the Tour de Nesle (a spot afterwards known as the rue Mazarine), and then in the Quartier St. Paul, was later transferred to the Tennis Court, or *jeu de paume*, of the 'Croix-Blanche,' in the Faubourg St. Germain. Here the Society assumed a professional character, and settled down for a time, but it was not a financial success. For thirteen years (that is, between 1646 and 1658, and therefore during the most agitated period of the Fronde) this Society, destined to become renowned, moved about from place to place in different parts of the country, a troupe of strolling players, battling with all kinds of difficulties and exposed to every manner of affront.

Richelieu, it is true, had accorded his protection to dramatic poets, yet it was by no means easy for strolling players in the provinces to secure a hearing in public. To obtain permission to set up their stage many formalities had to be complied with; consummate tact was called for to handle the susceptibilities of rival authorities; political and religious prejudices had often to be overcome, superstitions, like spectres, to be laid, and favours had to be granted.

Although in the early years of the seventeenth century organised stock companies of professional players at Paris were few, the Illustre Théâtre at the commencement of its career found already in the field two formidable rivals—the Théâtre du Marais, established in 1600 at the Hôtel d'Argent, and that of the Hôtel de Bourgogne—at which latter house Molière as a child received his first impressions of the drama. It was at the height of his fame that he wrote *L'Impromptu de Versailles*, in which he held up to ridicule the actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne.

Founded by the talented and beautiful actress, Madeleine Béjart, the association of the Illustre was practically the Béjart family—Béjart père, Madeleine his daughter, and her two brothers, Jacques

and Louis, both actors of some repute, notwithstanding their physical disadvantages. Of these drawbacks we get an insight in *Elomire Hypochondre*, if the author, Boulanger de Chalussay (who, by the way, was an unfriendly critic of Molière), may be trusted. Elomire (Molière in anagram) says to Angélique (who is supposed to represent Madeleine Béjart): 'Tes frères? Qui? Ce bègue, et ce borgne boiteux?'

The limping man with one eye was Louis Béjart, who came by his misfortune, we are told, in endeavouring to separate two friends who were quarrelling, sword in hand, in the Palais Royal. It was after this accident that he was allotted the part of La Flèche (in *l'Avare*), and is described by Harpagon as 'ce chien de boiteux-là.' According to Rival, subsequent actors assumed a limp not only in the character of La Flèche, but in all Louis' parts; which misdirected imitation seems an echo of the times of Menander and Plautus, when actors impersonating the parasites and panders ever present in the popular comedies themselves acquired something of their mannerisms and affectations. It also calls to mind that prince of flatterers, Cleisophos, a hanger-on at the Court of Philip of Macedon, who wore a bandage over his eye when the King's eye was injured by an arrow, made a wry grimace when His Majesty tasted anything sour, and limped at times in keeping with his royal patron.

Allied with the Béjarts was Mlle. Duparc, whom Molière, and many another, courted in vain. It was she whom the author of *le Cid* addressed as she was leaving Rouen:

Allez, charmante Iris, allez en d'autres lieux,
Semer les doux périls qui naissent de vos yeux.

The husband of this lady was surnamed Gros-René, and was probably the butt of Molière's ridicule (not wholly uninspired, perhaps, by his disappointment) in his plays *La jalousie de Gros-René* and *Gros-René écolier*, works which, unfortunately, have been lost.

We must remember also La Grange, who was appointed 'orator' of the troupe, for he was for many years a member of this stock company. The position of this functionary is dealt with at some length by Chapuzeau in *Le Théâtre Français*. Briefly summed up, his duties were to announce the plays about to be presented, and to whet the appetite of the spectators for the feast prepared for them; and by his wit and address, in a speech at the close of the entertainment, to dismiss the public in a good humour with what they had received, and with a craving for more. La Grange also filled leading parts in Molière's plays, and we owe to him the publication, in 1682, of the first complete édition of the great dramatist's works.

But the Béjarts, and the others we have recalled, are remembered now only because of their association with Molière. It was their Society in its early uphill days that the young Jean-Baptiste Pocquelin joined as an apprentice, and thenceforth assumed his professional

name, Molière. The assumption of a stage name was not only customary then, as at the present day, but in Molière's time it was common for an actor to call himself by several names, according to the nature of the character he was representing. Thus, le Grand was Belleville in comedy and Turlupin in farce; and Guéru was known as Fléchelles in tragedy and as Gautier Garguille in comedy.

It was in the Illustre Théâtre that Molière learnt stage business—the mechanism, so to speak, of dramatic spectacle. It was there he felt the first promptings of his talents as a playwright, and found in the Béjarts a warm appreciation of his budding gifts, and a readiness to present his works to the public. It is an open secret that he was in love with La Béjart (as Madeleine was called), but it is absurd to suppose (as some of his biographers have done) that this passion, by softening and sweetening his disposition, and thus making him more susceptible to refined and subtle impressions, was the cause of the unfoldment of the poet's genius and his future renown. A dominant cause should be conspicuous in its effects; but in Molière's works it is not the romantic, but the comic, side of life that is conspicuous. To judge of the effects of environment upon the germs of natural gifts the whole environment must be taken into account. One of Molière's apologists says of him that neither in success, nor in disappointment, nor on the slippery domain of the heart, does he lose his equilibrium. And why? we may ask. Because, like the tight-rope walker, his eye is fixed upon something *which is not himself*. He was susceptible of the excitement of the tender passion, but it did not turn his head. He looked inwards upon himself, but outwards as well upon the world, which is moved by many passions, and not by one passion alone. His interests were cosmopolitan. His eye sought the widest horizons. In the nature of the dramatic poet the influences of external observation and of self-analysis meet; in him they are the seed and the soil. Only by experience of both can the playwright discover the secret of touching the chords of mirth and feeling in others. He of all men must learn that the individual is a piece of the human mosaic, with a general resemblance to the whole, but is not in every respect a criterion of every other piece. No one realised this better than Molière, who so held up the mirror that the spectator saw both himself and his species, both the accidental and the universal in human nature, and thus his art was truly the *vita speculum et exemplar morum*.

In the practical school of the Illustre Théâtre, Molière discovered the chiaroscuro of his art—the proper distribution of light and shade in dramatic presentation; so, too, the subtle and various springs of human emotion and feeling came under his eye, and he perceived the different forces which excite them; and his ingenuity never failed to discern the methods of presenting such influences with the most telling effect.

It would be difficult to frame surroundings better calculated

to stimulate and train the gifts of the dramatic poet than those in the midst of which Molière found himself. In the seventeenth century the Italian school of comedy, based on the works of the Roman and Greek playwrights, and represented by Ariosto, Cardinal Bibbiena, Machiavelli, Ludovico Dolce, Lorenzino de Médicis and others, had the popular ear throughout France—in particular in the southern provinces, where Molière's apprenticeship was completed. This influence obtained from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century. The multiplicity of incidents crowded together in the works of these popular authors, the intrigues and surprises, the complicated plots, and their sudden and often improbable *dénouement*, appealed to the imagination of the Spanish and French dramatists, and were largely copied by them. That they were favoured, too, by Molière is seen in *l'Etourdi*, *le d'pît Amoureux*, *Dom Garcie de Navarre*, *le Médecin Volant*, and elsewhere. The literary atmosphere of the time was thus congenial, and useful to the poet, but it was not the source of his inspiration. To study the moral anatomy of human nature we must see it not darkly, as through a glass, but face to face, and the social upheaval that was going on around Molière gave him this opportunity. Those were not days when pains were taken to disguise prejudices, or to conceal passions, or to restrain the expression of feeling in speech or in act. As the players of the day had put aside the masks in which actors of classic times had strutted the boards, so the players on the social stage, under the violence of opposing social conditions then obtaining, stripped off every disguise and exposed their characters, with all their defects, to the light. What a museum was thus opened for the study of men and manners!

We must not confound the Italian playwrights we have named with the Italian comedians who, at a later date, performed for a short season at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. The plays of the latter were little better than improvisations, and can only by courtesy be said to belong to the literature of Italian comedy. This theatre, we are told in the *Memoirs* of Saint-Simon, was closed by the order of the King, and the players driven from the country, because they presented a piece called *la Fausse prude*, in which Madame de Maintenon (very thinly disguised) was held up to ridicule.

It may also be true that the stormy atmosphere of Molière's time was conducive not only directly to the evolution of his art, but to its appreciation and enjoyment. His aim was to amuse rather than to instruct, and it was amusement that was wanted. War at home and abroad, religious persecutions and uprisings, the evils attending an autocratic and arbitrary Government, social disturbances and changing fortunes, had become chronic, and the country was sick of it all. People wanted distraction, not mere buffoonery—whose effects may be telling in acute cases, but are transient and have a depressing reaction—but some legitimate intellectual excitement to mirth; and this was

the mood to welcome the exhilarating wit and piquant satire of the great comic playwright.

In the early days when Molière first joined the Illustre Théâtre the Society was financed by the Baron de Modéna, who had taken Madeleine Béjart under his protection. This protection was relaxed in 1646, when the Baron left Paris for the wars; and we may well suppose that his financial support was relaxed at the same time, and that it was this that decided the troupe of players to leave the capital, and try their fortunes in the provinces. Whatever the cause, the peregrinations that followed must have been of invaluable service to Molière in enlarging his experience of men and things and in ripening its fruit. He moved about midst constantly shifting scenes, playing all kinds of parts, learning stage-management, and studying the Greek and Latin playwrights. He had not the advantage of Madame Dacier's translations, which appeared some years later; nor, presumably, did he need translations, for we learn from Grimarest that he turned into French nearly the whole of Lucretius. De Villiers, in *la Zélinde*, speaks of Molière as one who had read all the satires of the old Italian and Spanish writers. He was familiar with Lope de Véga, the author of eighteen hundred comedies in verse! He knew too, probably, the dramatic works of Calderon, who was his contemporary; also those of Alexandre Hardy, Robert Garnier, and Paul Scarron, his own countrymen. Racine, perhaps, came too late to influence him, but the great Corneille and Boileau were his friends. During his thirteen years' wanderings Molière was all the time taking notes of the panorama of types and manners that passed before him. To realise how varied these pictures must have been, notwithstanding the fact that his travels were confined to his own country, we have only to remember that in the seventeenth century the differences between the customs, habits, and manners of the provinces and of the capital, and those between one province and another, were much more distinct and pronounced than at the present day. Interests, public and private, were more centralised; there was a degree of exclusiveness, arising from insulation and ignorance, that bred suspicion and excited jealousy; privileges were often confounded with rights, and customs with laws. A neighbouring province was regarded as a foreign country, and Paris often as an unfriendly Power. These moods, whether due to racial or to geographical causes, or to both, would exhibit variety of character and temperament, and modification of language, to a degree we cannot wholly appreciate at the present day; although such varieties in some particulars may still be found in an attenuated form in France, and, indeed, in every large country where the political links joining the parts together have been forged by conflict and conquest. True it is that human nature at bottom is one; and Molière, like Shakespeare, has drawn his pictures for all time because he perceived this kinship with the eye of an anatomist. But he

has given us something more than fundamental relations: he has added to them accidental traits, and characteristics, and local colouring, so that while his works are an epitome of the foibles, conceits, and vices common to the human race, they are also a history of the manners, fashions, and tastes of his day.

It is difficult to follow the route of the peregrinations of these strolling players. If traditions on the subject are a guide, there are few cities that were not visited by them. From the trustworthy evidence that is available it would appear that their journeyings were principally in the South—in the Land of the Troubadours, where the echoes of the songs of Gonkelin were still in the air; although they visited Rouen, Lyons, Nantes, and Grenoble, in which last town the Carnival was passed in 1658. The register of the Hôtel de Ville of Nantes, under date 'Jeudy 23 jour d'Avril mil six cent quarante huit,' says:

Ce jour est venu au Bureau le Sr. Morlicre, l'un des commédiens de la troupe du Dufresne, qui a remonstré que la reste de lad. troupe doit ariver ced. jour en ceste ville, et a supplyé très heumblement Messieurs leur permettre de monter sur le théâtre pour représenter leurs commédyes. Sur quoi, de l'advys commun du Bureau, a esté arresté que la troupe desd. commédiens tardera de monter sur le théâtre jusques à dimanche prochain, auquel jour il sera advisé ce qui sera trouvé à propos.¹

It was not, however, until the 17th of May that permission was obtained by the players to perform there. The Dufresne mentioned in the above extract (for which we are indebted to M. Péchout, of the National Library of Nantes) was the business manager of the troupe, and was associated with it throughout its travels. In those times, when people moved leisurely, and the flaming poster as *avant-courier* was unknown, the work of the *régisseur* was not so onerous as to prevent him taking part in the representations, and we may suppose that Dufresne (who had a certain reputation as a comedian) also performed on occasion with Molière. It was impossible for a dramatic performance to be advertised much in advance of the event, for application for permission to perform had to be made by the actors in person, evidence had to be furnished that the applicants were reputable, that the object of their entertainment was to amuse the public, without any ulterior design, and that the members of the troupe had no infectious disease. In addition to other matters (for the due consideration whereof it was essential that all the members of the Bureau applied to should meet in consultation), it was a condition to the granting of a licence that at least one performance should be given for the benefit of the local hospital. In the archives of the Hôtel Dieu at Lyons is a record that Molière and his troupe undertook to give the proceeds of two representations to the poor of that city. It is worth noting that this tax is levied upon players, almost

¹ For the full extract from the register see M. Moland's *Life of Molière*.

without exception, at the present day throughout France, and is paid by these warm-hearted people *con amore*. But permission to perform was only the first step to be taken by strolling players in Molière's day. To make their efforts a success much backstair climbing had to be done. The goodwill of magistrates, magnates, and other influential personages had to be secured, the smiles of local women of fashion to be won, the caprices of social butterflies to be humoured. Cajolery, flattery, promises and presents, and every device known to diplomacy, had to be employed to this end.

Between 1659 and 1664 (that is, after his wanderings came to a close) Molière is said to have written ~~ten~~ ^{twelve} plays, only two of which—*le Médecin Volant* and *La Jalousie de Barbouillé*—have been preserved. It is very probable that the outlines of these works, with some light and shade, had been broadly sketched in the provinces, and were suggested by characters and incidents that came under his eye at the time, and that the fresh impressions *d'après Nature* were afterwards elaborated by the author in Paris. A sketch from Nature is generally spoiled by being what is often improperly called 'finished' in the studio, and this may account for the absence of some of Molière's works. *Le Médecin Volant* is an adaptation of an Italian farce in which the doctor plays the harlequin—a nimble personage, constantly changing his guise, jumping through windows, here, there, and everywhere.

It was not uncommon with the Italian playwrights of the day to sketch the characters of a play, indicate the outlines of its plot, and determine the nature and periods of its *dénouement*, and to leave the actors free to supply their own dialogue. This course may have been followed in some of the lost plays, since it applies to the two of that period that have been preserved, for *le Médecin Volant* was developed later into *le Médecin malgré lui*, and *la Jalousie de Barbouillé* into *George Dandin*. This would not apply, perhaps, to *le Docteur Amoureux*—a piece of some importance, we may suppose, since it was commended by Boileau, and was much applauded when played before the King and the Queen-mother.

There is an amusing tradition of Toulouse which may be mentioned here. This is one of the many cities which claim to have afforded hospitality to the great dramatist and his troupe. Molière (says the tradition) was opposed in his application for a licence to perform at Toulouse by a certain doctor. He obtained the licence notwithstanding through the influence of some friends with the Capitoul; but he did not forgive the hostility of the doctor, and determined to make him suffer, if he could, for his opposition. Circumstances favoured this design. The poet made the acquaintance of a young man who was disconsolate because a certain demoiselle, the object of his affections, was about to be married, against her will, to a very objectionable old man.

'Does the young lady return your passion?' asked Molière.

'With all her heart,' replied the lover.

'And who is your rival?'

'The doctor who opposed your application.'

'Consider yourself out of your difficulties,' cried Molière with glee.

'See that your lady-love and her relations are at my spectacle to-morrow, and, above all, that this doctor is there too.'

The young man carried out these instructions to the letter; the performance took place; the doctor, when it was over, hurried away, with a laughing and jeering crowd at his heels; and the projected marriage was broken off by the young lady's relations. The play that Molière had presented was *le Docteur Amoureux*, and it was so written up by the author that the name-part depicted the manners, gestures, verbosity, and affectations of his enemy to the life, and these were so presented as to overwhelm him with ridicule.

Whether or not this tradition be well founded, it is at least plausible. At a time when 'gag' was largely allowed, and often encouraged, and, as we have said, not infrequently relied upon for the dialogue, and when the attitude of the players towards the spectators was familiar and confidential, almost to the degree that obtained in the days of Plautus and Terence, actors had the opportunity of setting off their private grievances against individuals by indulging on the stage in personalities, a possibility sufficient in itself to account for the suspicion with which they were regarded. To hold up to ridicule every form of cant and affectation was Molière's *métier*. He seemed to find particular satisfaction in castigating the frailties and conceits of the faculty. Is it too much to suppose that to his general distrust of the disciples of Hippocrates a personal animosity may have on one occasion been added?

In 1654 Molière's troupe were appointed comedians to the Prince of Conti. The Abbé de Cosnac (afterwards Archbishop of Aix) has given in his *Memoirs* a circumstantial account of how this distinction came about. The Prince of Conti was at his château of La Grange-des-Près, at Pézénas, with his mistress, Madame de Calvimont. The Abbé held an appointment in the household, and one of his duties was to cater for his patron's amusements, having, as he tells us, 'l'argent des menus plaisirs de ce prince.' Madame de Calvimont expressed the desire to be entertained by some comedians. It so chanced that La Béjart and her troupe were in Languedoc at the moment, and the Abbé engaged them to give a performance at the Château on a certain day. The players must have been gratified by this invitation, for de Conti was the Chief of the Army of the Fronde, an individual much in evidence at the time, and brother of the Grand Condé. To Molière it had a special significance, for he and the Prince had been at college together at Clermont. 'Les Comédiens,' says M. Jal, 'comme les trouvères, les ménestrels et les bateleurs, allaient

toujours frapper aux portes des châteaux royaux, pour tirer quelques bons profits de leur industrie,' and it appears that before the comedians arrived another troupe of players under the direction of Cormier came upon the scene, and so impatient was the Prince to be amused that he insisted upon their being retained in place of Molière's troupe. Besides the Prince's impatience there seems another reason for this sudden change of programme, for the Abbé says that 'les présents que fit la troupe de Cormier à Madame de Calvimont engagèrent à la retenir.'

When Molière and his colleagues found that their engagement was cancelled, they asked the Prince to at least refund them their travelling expenses; but 'M. le Prince avait trouvé bon de s'opiniâtrer à cette bagatelle.' When the Abbé told his patron that he had engaged Molière's troupe, the Prince replied that he himself had engaged Cormier's, and that it was more fitting for an Abbé than for a Prince to break his promise. This was not the opinion of de Cosnac, who rather than deceive Molière engaged him at his own expense to give a performance at the theatre at Pézénas. The representation cost two thousand écus — which would be 240*l.* or 480*l.*, according to whether the écus were small or large. It appears that the secretary of the Prince, Sarrasin (who had fallen in love with Duparc, the 'charmante Iris' of Corneille), persuaded his master to give Cormier his *congé*, and to bestow his special protection to the troupe of the Illustre Théâtre. This honour was enjoyed by Molière and his Society until the *Ecole des Femmes* and *Don Juan* were produced, when the Prince, taking offence at the extravagance and bad taste of those plays, withdrew his favour from their author. But when this came about Molière could afford to lose the Prince's protection. The good will of Armand de Conti was flattering and useful to a strolling player; but a player and author mounting by giant strides the ladder of fame, and playing in royal palaces, looked for something higher than the approbation of an individual like Conti, whom Cardinal Retz has described as 'un zéro qui ne se multiplioit que parce qu'il étoit prince du sang. . . . La méchanceté faisoit en lui ce que la foiblesse faisoit en M. d'Orléans.'

When Molière's travels came to an end, and the curtain had fallen on the vast scene of kaleidoscopic forms and colours they had afforded, there was yet another picture of human nature to be presented to him, one which was to be seen only at Paris, or, at all events, nowhere else on such a large canvas and in such a strong light. We refer to the school of the Hôtel de la Marquise de Rambouillet, the *réunion* of grand ladies and princes and of men of fashion, wit and learning. These '*Précieux*,' as they were called, are described by Moland as 'une sorte de secte qui tendoit à exagérer de plus en plus ces doctrines morales et littéraires. Dans le principe, la coterie aristocratique n'avoit pas été sans utilité, et le pouvoir qu'elle exerça eut plus d'un

résultat salulaire ; mais on étoit vite arrivé à un excès de pruderie romanesque ; et un goût purement artificiel.'

We are indebted to the follies and extravagances of these *beaux esprits* of the seventeenth century for Molière's *Précieuses Ridicules*, which, whilst it had the effect of producing a general reform in morals, taste, and in the polite arts, has made it impossible for the abuses it has exposed and corrected to recur. 'Croyez-moi,' said Ménage upon seeing the first representation of the comedy, '*il nous faudra brûler ce que nous avons adoré, et adorer ce que nous avons brûlé.*'

Molière affords one of the few examples there are of a poetical genius who is at the same time a man of affairs, having an eye to getting on in the world, and, as de Vizé puts it (when speaking of the dramatist's tact and insight), 'sachant ce qu'il falloit faire pour réussir.'

Passing from the protection of Conti, Molière and his troupe secured that of Philippe, the only brother of Louis the Fourteenth, and thus obtained the title of 'les Comédiens de Monsieur.'

If the early days of the Illustre Théâtre are obscured, it is because its leading spirit had not yet put forth its powers. On the later years of Molière's career there is the light that he himself shed. The poet-actor had become a star in the firmament that attracted the eye by its increasing brilliance. It was this lustre that so illuminated his course that the chroniclers could not lose sight of it. When, in 1658, he and his troupe returned to Paris, and by Royal favour were installed in the palace of Richelieu, the Illustre Théâtre was no more. As a society of strolling players it had passed away, for with Molière at its head, and some of his old colleagues still around him, it had become Le Théâtre du Roi.

DAVID H. WILSON.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

THE present system of agricultural education in the United States may be said to have originated with the Morrill Act of 1862. Long prior to this, spasmodic efforts had been made to advance the interests of agriculture through education. In 1796 Washington, in his annual Message to Congress, had recommended the establishment of a National University, pointing out that, with reference either to individual or national welfare, agriculture is of primary importance, and urging that, in proportion as nations advance in population, and other circumstances of material prosperity, this truth becomes more and more apparent, and renders the cultivation of the soil more and more an object of public patronage. At that time, however, Congress did not fall in with the suggestion, and various causes, such as the war of 1812-1815, contributed to retard the progress of agricultural education for many years. At length public opinion was rudely awakened to the necessity of taking some definite steps by the failure of the crops in 1837-38, and by the rapid exhaustion of the soil, which was becoming a matter of serious concern in all States bordering on the Atlantic seaboard. The agitation for agricultural education became general, and in New York petitions were presented to the Legislature asking for State-aid. A committee was appointed, and after deploring that 'there is no school, no seminary, no subdivision of any school in which the science of agriculture is taught,' advised the establishment of a school for this science. Between 1845 and 1850 agricultural schools were established by private enterprise in various places in the State, but Michigan was the first State to put into actual operation an educational institution for the direct promotion of technical training in agriculture. The constitution of that State, which was adopted in 1850, required that 'the legislature shall provide for the establishment of an agricultural school for agriculture, and the natural sciences connected therewith.' In pursuance of this proviso, the legislature passed an Act in 1855 authorising the Board of Education to organise such an institution, and a college, near Lansing, was formally opened in 1857, with sixty-one students and five

professors. Other States organised similar institutions, and the activity of the friends of agricultural education culminated in the Morrill Act. By this Act, which was introduced into the House of Representatives by Mr. Justin S. Morrill in December 1861, and to which President Lincoln affixed his signature on the 2nd of July, 1862, 30,000 acres of land for each member of Congress were bestowed upon the several States for the establishment of colleges 'to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts.' The amount of land actually allotted to the several States ranged from 24,000 acres in Alabama to 990,000 acres in the State of New York. Thus a territory comprising 9,559,241 acres altogether was appropriated out of the public lands of the United States for the purposes of education. Unwise management appears to have led many States to dispose of the land prematurely, but the total fund received from the sales amounts to about 2,250,000*l*.

The establishment of a National Board of Agriculture was long delayed by the indifference of the farmers and by certain constitutional difficulties. In 1836, when the Patent Office became a separate bureau, it undertook to help the farmers by the distribution of seeds and plants. This work grew, until Commissioner D. P. Holloway, of Indiana, brought forward an elaborate plan for the creation of a 'Department of the Productive Arts, to care for all the industrial interests of the country, but especially for agriculture.' Congress adopted a portion of the scheme, and on the 1st of July, 1862, a Department of Agriculture was formally organised. In 1864 an area of thirty-five acres in the city of Washington was assigned to the Department, and was used for some years as an experimental farm. The main building, at present occupied by the Department, was erected in 1868, when the grounds were converted into a landscape and botanic garden. New buildings, upon which Congress authorised an expenditure of 1,500,000 dollars, are now in course of erection. As originally defined, the duties of the Department were 'to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.' The Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the supervision of all public business relating to the agricultural industry, but has no direct control over the action of individual States beyond an advisory supervision over the experiment stations in receipt of grants from the National Treasury. In accordance with the Act of the 3rd of March, 1905, the Department includes nine distinct bureaux and four other divisions and offices. The appropriations for the Department have risen from 5,013,960 dollars in 1903 to 5,944,540 dollars in 1905. About 43,000*l*. are expended annually upon the Division of Publications alone, which includes the library. This

library is probably the most complete collection of agricultural and technical scientific literature in the world. It possesses between eighty and ninety thousand volumes and pamphlets, which are placed at the disposal of agriculturists and scientists in different parts of the country provided the loan of them does not interfere with the work of the Department. For the publications there is a constantly increasing demand. During 1904 the number issued was 972, in editions aggregating 12,421,386 copies. They are distributed to all public libraries, farmers, and people interested in agriculture, as well as to agricultural classes. In addition to the Department's publications, books on agricultural subjects are issued by nearly all the States and Territories of the Union, and distributed free at reduced postal rates to farmers and others.

As the establishment of the land-grant colleges proceeded, it was found that the income from the land-grant funds, even when supplemented by liberal contributions from the States and other sources, was inadequate. Mr. Morrill, therefore, introduced a second Bill, which became law on the 30th of August, 1890, providing for the annual appropriation to each State and Territory, out of the funds arising from the sale of public lands, of a further sum of 25,000 dollars for the more complete endowment and maintenance of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts. Under the two Morrill Acts colleges are now in operation in all the States and Territories except Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. The total number of these institutions is sixty-five, of which sixty-three now furnish courses of instruction in agriculture. In twenty-one States the agricultural colleges are departments of the State universities. In fifteen States and Territories separate institutions having courses in agriculture are maintained for the coloured race. All of the colleges for white persons and several of those for negroes offer four-year courses in agriculture and its related sciences leading to bachelors' degrees, and many provide for post-graduate study. About forty-five of them also provide special, short, and correspondence courses in the different branches of agriculture, including agronomy, horticulture, animal husbandry, poultry culture, cheese-making, dairying, sugar-making, rural engineering, farm mechanics, and other technical subjects. The total number of persons engaged in the work of education and research in the land-grant colleges and the experiment stations in 1901 was 4,666, and the number of students 56,226, of whom 4,640 were in the four-year course in agriculture and 5,281 in short, special courses. The course differs considerably in different colleges in regard to the requirements for admission and graduation. In some cases students are admitted direct from the common schools; in others, there is an entrance examination of the same standard as that required for matriculation at colleges of the first grade. With a few exceptions each college offers free tuition to residents of the State in which it is located.

Where the tuition is not free, scholarships are obtainable, and in all opportunities are given for some students to earn part of their expenses by their own labour. The expenses range from 125 to 300 dollars for the school year.

The organisation of the colleges varies a good deal, and they may be divided into three classes : (1) those having courses in agriculture only ; (2) those having courses in agriculture along with others in a variety of subjects, especially mechanic arts ; and (3) colleges (or schools or departments) of agriculture forming a part of universities. The following are types of each class :

(1) The Massachusetts Agricultural College. This is the only exclusively agricultural college in the United States. Attached to the college, which is situated at Amherst, is a farm of about 400 acres, of which 150 are under cultivation for field crops, and 100 are devoted to horticulture and forestry. There is a definitely prescribed curriculum for three years ; in the fourth and last year the student is allowed wide latitude of choice among numerous specialities, 'English' and 'military tactics' being the only compulsory subjects. It is interesting to note that 'military tactics' form a regular part of the instruction at nearly every college. On the completion of the four years' course students receive the degree of Bachelor of Science. Candidates for admission must be at least sixteen years old, and are required to pass an entrance examination. There are numerous scholarships and money prizes. The expenses for board and tuition amount to between 31*l.* and 62*l.* per annum. The college is under the general management of fourteen trustees appointed by the Governor, with four *ex-officio* members.

(2) Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. The agricultural and mechanical colleges have such different organisations that no single institution will serve as a type of them all. The Iowa College, at Ames, however, represents those institutions whose development has been along broad lines, and in which the agricultural course, maintained side by side with a number of courses in the arts and sciences, is being more thoroughly organised and specialised in accordance with the general advance in educational ideas. It was founded in 1859 by the State as a purely agricultural college, and did not assume its present character until the passing of the Morrill Act in 1862. The college lands comprise about 1,000 acres, of which 120 are set apart for college grounds and form a beautiful park. Considerable attention is paid to animal husbandry. The farm consists of rolling prairie, bottoms and woodland, and is stocked with pedigree representatives of different breeds of horses, cattle, sheep, and hogs. These animals are used in class illustrations and for various experiments in breeding and feeding for milk, meat, wool, growth, and maintenance, conducted by the experiment station as a department of the college. All the crops of the farm are grown for some educa-

tional purpose ; all the animals are fed by rule and system, and the results of their management reported upon and used in class work. Labour is not compulsory, but students in the agricultural course are given work that is educational and parallel with their studies. The full course lasts four years, but there is also a two years' course in agriculture, a one-year course in dairying, together with short summer and winter courses. Students are admitted at the age of sixteen after an examination, or upon a certificate from certain high schools and academies. The expansion of the college has recently been so great that the following additional State grants were made in 1904 : 50,000 dollars to the maintenance fund, 95,000 dollars for the completion of the central building, 45,000 dollars for a dairy building, 10,000 dollars towards equipping it, 22,000 dollars for a new dairy farm and 7,000 dollars for equipment, and 54,500 dollars to begin the construction of heating plant, with several minor items, including 15,000 dollars annually for the experiment station.

(3) Cornell University. This university, at Ithaca, in the State of New York, which was opened on the 7th of October, 1868, and has now perhaps more resources than any other at its command for education and research, owes its origin partly to the Morrill Acts and the action of the State Legislature, and partly to the munificence of Mr. Ezra Cornell. He endowed it with 100,000*l.* and 200 acres of land, with useful buildings, besides smaller gifts for special purposes. The College of Agriculture, which is now definitely organised under State support with an appropriation of about 50,000*l.* for buildings and equipment, is divided into six departments, fully equipped for a thorough course of scientific and practical instruction. There are four grades or distinctive courses of instruction : (a) Advanced or post-graduate, leading up to the degrees of Master or Doctor of Science ; (b) the regular course in agriculture, covering a period of four years (for admission to this course candidates must be at least sixteen years old, or, if women, seventeen) ; (c) a shorter special course of two years or less for those who are preparing to become farmers, but cannot spend four years in study (eighteen is the age for admission to this course) ; and (d) short winter courses. Instruction in each of these courses is free except for small incidental fees of about 1*l.* a term, and of about 2*l.* a term in the dairy course, to cover the cost of materials. The expense of boarding in the town of Ithaca is from about 60*l.* to 100*l.* per annum. The college estate comprises 270 acres, of which 125 acres are used as a college farm, and ten acres are devoted to the gardens, orchards, and nurseries of the horticultural department. By no means the least valuable of the services rendered by the college has been the preparation and world-wide circulation of the famous Cornell nature-study leaflets, which did so much a few years ago to popularise and encourage nature-study in England. In his letter of transmittal, which forms the preface to

a selection of these leaflets published last year, Mr. Bailey, director of the College of Agriculture, makes the following significant remarks :

The reader should bear in mind that the College of Agriculture has no organic connection with the public school system of New York State, and that its nature-study work is a propaganda. From first to last the college has been fortunate in having the sympathy, aid, and approval of the State Department of Public Instruction, and now of the new Education Department. The time is now near at hand when nature-study will be adequately recognised in the school system of the State, and then the nature-study work of the College of Agriculture may be the new form.

Instruction in agriculture of the intermediate or secondary grade has for some years been given at the Hampton Institute in Virginia, and at the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, for coloured students. In 1895 a secondary school of agriculture was organised at the University of Minnesota. Other schools of the same grade were subsequently established in Nebraska, New Jersey, and elsewhere. This branch of agricultural education presents peculiar difficulties, but the results are said to be very satisfactory not only in the schools connected with agricultural colleges, but also in separate secondary schools, of which the number is steadily increasing.

By an Act of 1887, which was passed on the initiative of Mr. W. H. Hatch, of Missouri, it was provided that a sum of about 3,125*l.* a year should be given out of the funds arising from the sale of public lands to each State and Territory for the establishment of an experiment station, which was to be a department of the land-grant colleges. There are now fifty-six experiment stations in the United States, with others in Hawaii, Alaska, and Porto Rico. Steps have also been taken to establish one in the small island of Guam. As defined by the Hatch Act, the 'object and duty' of the stations are research and experiments on the physiology of plants and animals, their diseases and remedies, the chemical compositions of useful plants, analyses of soils and water, manurial experiments, and so forth. The real purpose and importance of sound agricultural investigations has not always been realised by all the States, and the funds under the Hatch Act have been diverted into educational channels. At the convention of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations at San Francisco in July 1899, Dr. H. P. Armsby, director of the Pennsylvania agricultural station, drew particular attention to this point, and urged that the aim of the stations should be research and not popular education. The difficulty has not yet wholly disappeared, but Mr. James Wilson, secretary to the Department of Agriculture at Washington, states in his last report that 'not a year passes but that some stations are persuaded by this Department to forego expenditures of the Federal funds, which under the terms of the Hatch Act they might technically insist they

had a legal right to make, but which, after discussion, they are convinced are not in the best interests of their work.'

. With the idea of reaching those who cannot or will not attend a college, reading courses for farmers have been arranged in many States. The object of the courses is 'to touch and awaken every farmer, particularly every poor farmer; to search out the man who has small opportunities.' The movement was inaugurated by the State College of Pennsylvania in 1892. A reading course for farmers was prepared on the plan of the well-known Chautauqua courses in other subjects. This included "a carefully prepared course of reading designed to cover the most important branches of agricultural science and practice, personal advice and assistance through correspondence, and examinations upon the subjects read, with certificates and diplomas for those attaining certain degrees of excellence.' Books are provided by the State College, printed lessons are then sent out on the particular subjects treated in books, and the students are invited to answer questions. The methods adopted vary in different States. In connection with the Agricultural College at Cornell University

the gist of the plan is to give the farmer a short specially prepared lesson, and then to quiz him upon it. The motive is to reach the many, not the few. The farmer who can and will read books can take care of himself, but the one who cannot or will not needs help, whether he wants it or not. The idea is to get the rank and file to read books by first instructing them in simple, short, and easily digested matter. When the farmer is once interested, it needs only good administrative machinery to keep him interested and lead him on.

Every inducement is offered to persuade readers to organise themselves into small clubs, and it is not unusual to hire farmers to form such clubs. Farmers' institutes were held during the year ending June 1904 in all of the States and Territories with the exception of Arkansas, South Dakota, Wyoming, Alaska, Indian Territory, and Porto Rico, the total number of meetings being 3,306, with an attendance of 841,698. Their programmes are planned to promote the interchange of ideas, a full and free discussion being sought on topics introduced by some successful farmer or specialist. They are held, as a rule, in the winter, and answer the purpose of an adult farmers' school. It is hoped that they may be placed on a more permanent basis with strong local organisation, combined with a system of oversight and limited control by the central State authority.

Agricultural clubs for lads engaged at farms have within the last three years been formed in Illinois, where the movement originated, Iowa, Ohio, and Texas. The clubs arrange visits to leading farms and excursions to the State Colleges of Agriculture. Opportunities are provided for the study of farm management, fertility, and all the conditions likely to affect materially the yield and quality of the crops grown. Lectures on stock-breeding, birds and their benefit

to farmers, useful and injurious insects, &c., are given in each district. There are excellent travelling libraries, to which the members of the clubs have access ; and all the great agricultural institutions afford the fullest facilities for the inspection of their apparatus, live-stock, and field experiments. In this way the influence of the best agricultural teaching is being brought to bear upon the lads without interfering with their duties on the farm. ' Gradually, but surely,' says Professor Crosby, of the Office of Experiment Stations, ' it grows upon them that all farming is not drudgery ; that there is abundant opportunity to plan, study, investigate ; that intelligence and culture are needed on the farm ; and that the proper exercise of these qualities will yield as abundant returns in the country as in the city.'

JOHN C. MEDD.

THE PARIS NATIONAL WORKSHOPS OF 1848

I

‘WE are all Socialists now!’ the late Sir William Harcourt said, a few years ago, with the customary exaggeration of epigrammatic speaking. This had, of course, to be understood with more than one grain of salt. For, men to whom the name of Socialist really applies—that is, those who advocate the nationalisation not only of the land, but of all means of production, distribution, and exchange—were not much impressed by the genuineness of the offered companionship.

On his part, the Right Hon. John Morley clings with strange persistence to the other extreme; namely, to the individualistic doctrine of the old Manchester School. Being in the Cabinet with Mr. John Burns, these two men represent exactly the opposite type of views about political economy. To both, their adherents have given the caressing name of ‘Honest John.’* And, no doubt, both mean well, each from his own standpoint. I will not discuss these differences here, beyond saying that the question of the workless, which has recently given rise to colossal demonstrations in Hyde Park and elsewhere, is not one to be treated by a mere *non possumus*. The vast increase of a proletariat in the overgrown great towns of England is certainly a phenomenon of much significance. Here, we come upon a subject which, in such discussions, often turns up, but which, for ever so many years, has been curiously darkened by the most extraordinary misrepresentations. I mean the so-called National Workshops (*Ateliers Nationaux*), established at Paris in 1848, in the wake of the Revolution of February, which overthrew Louis Philippe and founded the Second Republic.

During the recent elections, Mr. Morley said that he had ‘no remedy to suggest for the great problem of the unemployed,’ and would not propose a quack medicine. He added:—‘The formation of National Workshops in France, in 1848, ended in a terrible catastrophe.’ Being afterwards called upon by a deputation of the various Labour and Socialistic bodies at Arbroath, he again spoke of what is generally alleged to have been a Socialistic experiment, but which turned out an utter failure.

The speaker of the deputation, who opened the discussion, began by asserting that 'it was the right of everybody born to have an opportunity of earning their living in their country, and further declared that when private enterprise failed to supply that opportunity, it was the duty of the State to secure it.' Incidentally, I will here only remark that this 'Right to Labour' (*Droit au Travail*), as it was called in France, has been acknowledged even in Germany, in centuries gone by, by Prussian Kings, and is virtually inscribed in their *Landrecht*, or Law-code of old.

Now, in answer to the Labour and Socialist deputation, Mr. John Morley said :—

Their proposal really meant that the State was bound to provide work at a living wage ('Yes!'), at a standard wage ('Yes!'). They were quite right in shaking their heads defiantly at him (laughter). That experiment was tried in France in 1848; and what was the effect? There they set up public workshops and the rest of it; and they paid a wage at a very high rate. The result was, that private enterprise was drained dry. The end was wreck and ruin in six months; private workshops were injured; the men were no better off; and it ended in a bloody and sanguinary catastrophe. He did not say that it would end so here.

So Mr. Morley thinks that the National Workshops were a Socialist experiment. He will be astonished to find, when studying the subject from the sources, that the very contrary was the case. He is known as an ardent student of French literature, and has written important works on Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and the Encyclopædists. But, evidently, he is unacquainted with the facts concerning the National Workshops and the terrible Insurrection of June 1818.

II

So far from the *Ateliers Nationaux* having been established as a Socialist measure, they actually owed their special organisation to the antagonists of Socialism. They were positively intended to be used against the very leader of that party—namely, against Louis Blanc; nay, even against simple advanced Republicans, like Ledru-Rollin, both of whom were members of the Provisional Government, and both of whom were not even consulted on the subject of organisation. Any one who has had personal experience in a revolution will easily understand how such things happen in a time of popular upheaval, when the power of various groups often fluctuates from day to day; sometimes from hour to hour.

I will pass by the mistake made by Mr. Morley when he said that the National Workshops lasted six months. They barely existed for four months. In the first flush of the revolutionary movement, on the 27th of February, there was only an announcement of a few lines inserted in the *Moniteur*, saying :—'The Provisional Government decrees the establishment of National Workshops. The Minister of Public Works

is charged with the execution of the present decree.' All details were, however, left to the future.

When it came to the question of how these Workshops should be instituted, M. Marie, a most determined antagonist, or, as Louis Blanc says, in his *Historical Recollections*, one of the fiercest adversaries, of Socialism, framed a corresponding decree after a discussion held, not in the Council of the Provisional Government, as it ought to have been for so important a measure, but independently of the Council. That decree is dated the 6th of March, 1848. Here, Louis Blanc, the falsely reputed organiser, says ¹:—

MM. Buchez, Flottard, Barbier, Tremisot, Robin, Marie, Michel, Baude, Ouffroy de Bréville: these were the persons who were summoned to decide that terrible question which, as the event proved, bore the seeds of the insurrection of June. M. Marie was there, of course; and M. Garnier Pagès, Mayor of Paris, presided. As for myself, I had neither been consulted, nor even informed of the meeting; it was too well known how opposed I was in principle to the ideas which they sought to carry out.

This statement is fully borne out by the man who was chosen by M. Marie as Director of the National Workshops; that is, by M. Emile Thomas. With him, Louis Blanc was not even acquainted by sight, and his selection by M. Marie was, as Louis Blanc adds, owing to

his (Emile Thomas') ardent indefatigable opposition to my doctrines. The declarations of M. Emile Thomas himself before the Commission of Inquiry leave no doubt upon this point. First, in his deposition of the 28th of July, 1848, M. Emile Thomas says:—'I have never spoken to M. Louis Blanc in my life; I don't know him.' Again: 'While I was at the head of the Workshops, I saw M. Marie daily, sometimes twice a day; MM. Buchez, Rocurt, and Marrast almost every day. Never once M. Ledru-Rollin, nor M. Louis Blanc, nor M. Flocon nor M. Albert.

The last named was the working-man member of the Provisional Government—so to say, the John Burns of his time.

Again, M. Emile Thomas, the Director of the National Workshops, deposed before the Committee of Inquiry on the same day:—'I always went along with the Mayoralty of Paris, in opposition to MM. Ledru-Rollin, Flocon, and others. I was in open hostility to the Luxembourg. I openly contested the influence of M. Louis Blanc.' The Luxembourg was the place where Louis Blanc expounded his own views before the working classes.

So it was a mere section of the revolutionary Government, wholly antagonistic to Socialism, which organised the so-called National Workshops. In them, as Louis Blanc shows, men of the most different trades, or of no trade at all, were put to the same kind of work, or manual labour—a 'prodigious absurdity'! It was utterly unproductive work, besides being such as the greater part of them were

¹ All the quotations given here, and in the following pages, from Louis Blanc's work, are in his own English.

unaccustomed to. This action of the State was simply squandering the public funds; its money, a premium upon idleness; its wages, alms in disguise.

The object of the men who set up this scheme under the high-sounding title of National Workshops was simply to gather together, pell-mell, a 'rabble of paupers,' as Louis Blanc calls them in the English edition of his '*Recollections* : ' *un rassemblement tumultueux de prolétaires*, in his fuller French work. They were men 'whom it was enough to feed, from the want of knowing how to employ them, and who had to live together without any other ties than a military organisation, and under chiefs who bore the name, at once so strange, and yet so characteristic, of sergeant-majors, brigadiers.' In case of need, secret service funds were to be supplied; and on the day coming for action against the more advanced Republicans, this tumultuous crowd of proletarians was to be launched into the streets.

What a different picture from the one drawn by Mr. John Morley !

III

All that is said here is proved up to the hilt by a number of official documents; by the extensive evidence brought out before the Commission of Inquiry appointed by the National Assembly; by the fullest avowals of the men implicated in the intrigue; by the *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux*, whose author was their Director; by the public declaration of Lamartine, the head of the Provisional Government, and of Arago and Garnier Pagès, its most prominent members.

There is an instructive account of a secret conversation held in a low tone between M. Marie and the Director of the National Workshops as to the ultimate use to which these oddly collected men were to be put. M. Emile Thomas himself gave the account. The number of men gathered together had become so great, that the Director confessed he had not so firm an influence over them as he could wish.

'Don't be uneasy about the number !' [the Minister (M. Marie) rejoined]. 'If you hold them in hand, the number can never be too large. But find some means of attaching them to you sincerely ! Don't spare money ; if necessary, you may be supplied *with secret funds* . . . The day is, perhaps, not far distant when it may be necessary to march them into the street.'

In other words, the idea was to use, some day, a well-paid mass of proletarians, accustomed to little and quite useless work, and formed into a kind of brigades, against both Socialists and advanced Republicans of the type of Louis Blanc, Albert, Flocon, and Ledru-Rollin.

What does Lamartine, otherwise also an opponent of Socialism, say ? He was originally in favour of employing those enrolled in the National Workshops for productive agricultural labour 'on a large scale. Nothing of the kind was, however, done. Of those hastily collected proletarians he says, in Louis Blanc's translation :—

They were merely an expedient for preserving order—a rude auxiliary summoned on the morrow of the Revolution by the necessity of feeding the people, and not feeding them idle, in order to avoid the disorders of idleness. M. Marie organised them with skill, without any useful result as regards productive labour. He formed them into brigades; he gave them chiefs; he communicated to them a spirit of discipline and order. Instead of being a force at the mercy of Socialists and insurrectionists, he, for the space of four months, made of them a *Prætorian Band*—inactive, indeed, but at the disposal of Power. Commanded, directed, sustained by chiefs who were *in secret concert with the anti-Socialist part of the Government*, the workshops served, until the appearance of the National Assembly, as a counterpoise to the sectarian operatives of the Luxembourg and the seditious operatives of the Clubs. They scandalised Paris by their numbers and the inutility of their labour; they more than once protected and saved Paris without its being conscious of it. So far from being in the pay of Louis Blanc, as has been said, *they were the device of his enemies.*

So Lamartine. Surely, when reading such testimony, Mr. Morley may be expected, with his usual fairness of mind, to revise his opinion as to the National Workshops of 1848 having been a Socialist experiment. For my part, I can state all this with the greater impartiality, because, though an intimate friend of Louis Blanc down to his death, I do not share all the views he held in matters of political economy during his earlier career—views on which, in later days, he himself did not lay stress to their former extent.

I know, however, how deeply he was affected all through life, whenever the old misstatement, as to the National Workshops having been his product, cropped up again with that persistence of ‘a lie which, once born, is immortal,’ as Napoleon the First used to say. Napoleon understood that well, for he was the author of many similar fabrications.

Often Louis Blanc came to me in mental distress when the allegation in question was once more revived in England, asking me for help to refute it. Hence, I held it to be a duty to state what I have written here.

IV

When at last, in June 1848, owing to the scandal spoken of by Lamartine, the National Workshops were dissolved by M. Trélat, the successor of M. Marie, it was done in a way apt to give rise to dangerous disturbances. A decree was issued by the Ministry of Public Works, in these words :—

The unmarried working-men (in the National Workshops), between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five, will be invited to enrol themselves under the banners of the Republic, to complete the different regiments of the Army. Those who refuse to enlist as volunteers will be immediately removed from the *listes d’embrigadement* of the National Workshops. Masters may call upon as many of their working-men (of the National Workshops) as they may declare wanted for the resumption or continuation of their business. Those who refuse will be immediately removed from the general list of the National Workshops.

Thus all those unwilling to 'make themselves food for powder,' as Louis Blanc says (there was then no universal compulsory service), or who could not find re-engagements for work, were, all of a sudden, thrown helpless and hungry into the streets. They were joined by other proletarians, and a rising in arms was the result. Thus the terrible Insurrection of June began.

But it was not even an exclusively working-class or proletarian rising, as is generally, but erroneously, believed by those who do not know all the facts. The truth is, that Bonapartist and Legitimist agents had already for some time tried to get influence among the suffering toilers. The National Workshops themselves had been tampered with by them. The Bonapartist Pretender, who later on was elected, by the mass vote of the ignorant rural population, to the Presidency of the Republic, and who in December of 1851 perpetrated his murderous midnight State-stroke, had already, in June 1848, shown his hand in a notable intrigue. It is said that a letter of his, addressed to General Rapatel on the 22nd of June, in the midst of the rising, was couched in this sense :—

'General! I know your sentiments for my family. If the events which are in course of formation turn out in a way favourable to it, you will be appointed Minister of War.

'(Signed) NAPOLEON LOUIS BONAPARTE.'

So great was the danger of Bonapartist and Royalist intrigues, that the delegates of the workmen of the Luxembourg (that is, Louis Blanc's adherents), with some delegates of the National Workshops, issued a warning manifesto. The masses were told :—

We pray you, in the name of that Liberty so dearly bought, in the name of the country regenerated by you, in the names of Fraternity and Equality, neither by work, nor act, to lend your arms and your hearts to encourage the partisans of the throne which you lately burnt . . . The reaction is at work and in movement. Its numerous emissaries will entice you, Brothers, with unrealisable and senseless dreams. It is sowing gold broadcast. Beware, Brothers, beware! Wait yet a few days with that calmness which you have already shown, and which is your true strength. . . . Believe us; listen to us! Nothing is possible now in France but the Democratic and Social Republic! . . . No more *Emperors*, nor Kings. Nothing but Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

By this appeal, a number of prominent Social Democrats sought to prevent the rising, though in vain. Hunger would not listen to advice. A three days' sanguinary street battle followed. Victor Schölcher, the former Minister of the Colonies under the Provisional Government, and a common friend of Louis Blanc and Ledru-Rollin—even as I was of them—has proved, in his work, that Bonapartists, Orleanists, and Legitimists from the *ban-lieue*, the neighbourhood of Paris, marched up to the capital to take part in the insurrection, which they tried to make use of for the overthrow of the Republic.

Finally, the movement was drowned in blood by General Cavaignac.

A terrible system of drumhead law, of indiscriminate shooting of captives, and of proscriptions, followed. Louis Blanc himself, falsely charged, sought safety in flight.

V

I cannot leave this painful subject without mentioning that Louis Blanc himself committed a fatal error as regards the Bonapartist Pretender, whose acquaintancè he had made years before, when the latter was a prisoner at Ham, in consequence of his attempt to overthrow Louis Philippe. When the question came before the National Assembly of 1848, whether Louis Bonaparte, the Imperialist Pretender, should be admitted to the soil of France, having been elected a deputy by one of the constituencies, Lamartine and Ledru-Rollin clearly saw the danger ahead. They spoke sensibly and strongly against such readmission.

Louis Blanc took the opposite side.

'Don't magnify' [he exclaimed] 'the stature of pretenders by keeping them at a distance. What we want is, to see them near, that we may take a juster measure of their size. . . . What said Louis Bonaparte's uncle? "That the Republic is like the sun." Well, let the Emperor's nephew approach the sun of our Republic! I am confident he will disappear in his rays.'

Unfortunately he did not. Louis Blanc said that Louis Bonaparte 'had not only tendered his allegiance to the Republic, but actually offered it his services.' He, therefore, should be allowed to have a fair trial; and 'the Government, especially a Republican one, was bound in duty to wait for some overt act of conspiracy,' before judging him.

But had not the Imperial uncle, who said that the Republic was like the sun and did not want being formally recognised by any foreign Power, afterwards destroyed that sun?

I have at various times, in exile, discussed this subject with my French friend. One of these occasions was when he showed me the copy of Louis Bonaparte's pamphlet, *L'Extinction du Paupérisme*, given to him by the imprisoned Pretender at Ham, with a friendly inscription. Louis Blanc then said to me, the very words which are to be found in his *Historical Recollections* :—'He (Bonaparte) is now on a throne; and I am in exile.'

Still, even on that occasion, Louis Blanc would not avow that he had made a bad mistake. He always pleaded that, if his proposition had been adopted, that 'in the French Republic, founded on the 24th of February, 1848, there shall be no such office as that of President,' Louis Bonaparte could never have been any real danger. But in politics, possibilities and probabilities must be reckoned with. As to general maxims of 'generosity' towards men whose evil aims are patent to anyone possessed of a degree of psychological insight, such maxims are out of place in times of revolution, when the first

rule must be, to guard the scarcely won liberties against manifest Pretenders.

I have given this description of the true character of the Paris National Workshops, not only from historical documents, but also from personal recollection. I lived in those days on what then still was French soil, at Strassburg, in temporary proscription, after the overthrow of the first Republican rising in Germany. There was a mass of fellow-exiles in that town, and I was at the head of a Committee of Relief for them. The reign of terror established at Paris, after the sanguinary struggles in June, had its effect even in that far-off Alsatian town. I was arrested without any formal charge, kept for a while in prison, and finally transported in handcuffs—under that Republic with whose cause I sympathised—to Switzerland.

There was a plan of police agents—many of whom were the same as had served under Louis Philippe—to deliver me over stealthily, during the transport, to the Government authorities of Baden. This scheme was foiled by the honest Republican mayor of Strassburg, Mr. Kiss, and by the mayor of St. Louis, near the Swiss frontier, who, though a Monarchist, said to me, that he would not soil his honour by complicity in such a plot. He was an old soldier who had served in the Napoleonic wars.

Two friends of mine, and fellow-exiles, Nerlinger and Roman Schweitzer, had, unobserved by the gendarmes, followed in the same railway train, armed with guns, in order to come to my rescue in case of need, if an attempt were made to deliver me over across the German frontier near Basel. In this way, I arrived safely in free Switzerland. The first thing I heard there was, that proceedings had been instituted against Louis Blanc, and that he had been compelled to seek safety in England. This was in August 1848.

When, after a subsequent successful Democratic rising in Baden and Rhenish Bavaria, I resided at Paris, in 1849, as a member of a combined Embassy of those two countries, I was imprisoned there, under the Presidency of Louis Bonaparte. It was done in violation of the law of nations, after the failure of Ledru-Rollin's movement in aid of the Roman Republic. In the prison, 'La Force,' I was then still shown the marks of stray bullets, spent during the execution of captives from the rising of June 1848, who had been killed in the prison-yard by drumhead law, or no law whatever, under the dictatorship of General Cavaignac. The vivid impression created by all these events has made the affair of the National Workshops all the more interesting to me, for more than one reason.

KARL BLIND.

THE AUSTRALIAN CORROBOREE

IN a recent number of this Review appeared an article illustrated with stories showing forth the intelligence of the Australian aborigines. It is refreshing to find someone to take up the cudgels on behalf of the much maligned native. Numerous scientific men have made systematic studies of the race, but their works, although valuable from an ethnological point of view, have shown a tendency to neglect those human traits which are of most interest to the layman.

As a boy in a small Western Queensland township, the present writer remembers reading in the school-books that 'the natives of New Holland are the lowest race on earth.' It was hard for us as children to reconcile the statement with the intelligence shown by our black playmates. We found them merry companions, full of fun and good-humour. Our games of 'purru-purru,' a sport somewhat akin to Rugby football, and swinging the 'bujaram,' were learnt from them. In keenness of perception and general alacrity we were their inferiors, and in a certain quality of cheery sportsmanship they were models to all.

The mistake that the old scientists made lay in drawing hasty conclusions from easily perceived facts. They found that the aborigines were split up into small tribes, with no common groundwork of vocabulary and no written language. They also found them destitute of any idea of tilling the soil. From this they deduced that they were a people ranking lowest in the scale of human intelligence.

They, however, failed to make allowance for the special circumstances in which the aborigines were placed. The land was sparsely populated, but game was everywhere abundant. Over the vast plains roamed herds of kangaroos, and the broad bushlands held marsupials in abundance. Moreover, the country, though fertile in season, was ill-adapted for tillage by reason of the uncertainty of its rainfall. Under such circumstances it was obvious that the natives must be a race of hunters, following the game from one part of the country to another. And a written language of necessity springs up from a settled people, not from a roving one.

The scientists also overlooked some important characteristics of the mental equipment of the aboriginal, among others his sense of

humour. Dr. Roth relates that when they were gathered together in camp they would make imprints in the wet sand of the feet of animals and birds. Then they would draw the footmark of a white man, exaggerating it in length to ten or twelve inches, amidst roars of laughter.

This is possibly not a high type of humour, but it is quite on a level with the modern joke about the size of policemen's feet. And it can be shown that in many other ways their perception of the ludicrous was keen. Old bushmen relate how they have found a funny story travel many miles from one blacks' camp to another, and how an aboriginal who has come in contact with the whites will mimic their ways to his companions with a clever pungency of satire. Then, as a means of expression for any phase of beauty that comes into their lives, they have their original art-form, the corroboree.

It has been the custom to treat the corroboree as merely a wild native dance, but its significance is greater than this. As an art-form it is akin to the modern musical comedy, but it is generally infused with a crude spirit of poetry, which the latter lacks. Of course, dancing in some form or other is the natural expression of healthy human beings, and most races have their form of national dance. Of late years, however, these forms have been chiefly confined to the hired performers of the ballet, and have lost their emotional meaning, but the corroboree is a genuine outlet to the feelings of the aboriginals. Into it they have woven all their tales of romance and their imaginative dreams.

Some of these corroboree tales have a pathos and poignancy which show a true literary instinct in their creators. Others have a quaint flavour of morality. Take this one for instance, which is general in some form or other among all the north-eastern tribes :

A native was returning from the hunt, with his bags laden with game. An innocent bird hovered above his head, and at length settled on a tree before him. Out of wantonness he lifted his boomerang and threw it with force at the bird. But it happened that the god Targan had known the wickedness of his heart, and had taken the shape of a bird to tempt him. So the boomerang flew wide of its mark, and, coming back with the swiftness of a lightning flash, struck its thrower dead to the ground.

There is a trace of universal morality about this that argues a people not altogether devoid of the ethical sense. To tell the truth, however, it is rather in the nature of an exception. Most of the corroboree tales have for their hero the wickedly clever man, or the strong pitiless overman, who treads everyone mercilessly beneath him. Others are merely fantastic dreams, handed down from generation to generation, as the folk-lore of the tribe. Here is one of the latter variety, paraphrased from the reminiscences of Mr. T. Petrie, one of the oldest of Queensland settlers :

Three brothers living together on an island in the sea loved the same girl, the daughter of a great chief. In return she loved one of them, the weakest

of the three, and at length married him. To hide her away from his brothers, he carried her to a cave under the sea, and daily brought her food. Their suspicions were aroused and they were eaten up with jealousy, but being double-tongued, they coaxed her out with promises to build the couple a splendid new humpy. Then they did all in their power to kill their brother. One day on the beach he was caught fast in a shell, and they left him to die. But a bird, with blood dripping from its beak, told the girl of his fate, and she died of grief. The brothers thought that by finding her lover they could bring her back to life, but he had drifted out to sea, turning into a fish, and then into a beautiful coloured rainbow. And she turned into the flowers of the bread-fruit tree, so that they could always gaze upon one another.

It is curious to note that the aborigines always persist that these stories come to them in their sleep. A man dreams a corroboree, and while it is impressed vividly on his brain tells it to the head of his tribe. If the latter finds the tale striking, and suitable for reproduction, a proclamation is made, and the necessary performers selected. On some occasions a whole day is devoted to dressing and preparation, each man jealously concealing his form of adornment from his neighbour. To the onlooker, of course, there seems little variety in the garb, consisting as it does mainly of coats of grease and feathers fixed on with blood, but the diversity lies in the different patterns printed on the body with red ochre.

The duration of the performance is necessarily regulated by the nature of the subject. It is no uncommon thing for one to extend itself over five or six nights, but the simpler ones generally last but a few hours. Among these are the little lyrical folk-songs, which the aborigines love, and of which they never seem to tire, as for instance the story of the water-lizard :

A water-lizard lay basking on a log by the creek. It was a warm day and the air was full of a pleasant heat. Presently a native came by, and hunted the lizard away. As it slipped into the water it said reproachfully, 'Why did you disturb me when I was happy in the sun ?'

The substance of this is impressed into a few four-line choruses, and is sung over and over again. It is to be noted that in all these imaginative tales the lower animals take their place quite on a level with man. Birds and beasts reason with their hunters, or form leagues and outwit them. Emus and kangaroos take up their positions in the councils and corroborees. There is even a suggestion of a faun-like alliance with nature. In one tale, a tree grows miraculously in order to bear a hunted man up out of the reach of his enemies.

The longer corroborees generally consist of accounts of wonderful floods or bush-fires. Generally, when a fight took place between two rival tribes, it was rehearsed in every detail, with a few warlike songs inserted describing the occasion. Once, during the early days of European settlement, a white man fell in love with a black girl. She would not leave her people to marry him, so he renounced civilisation and went to live with the tribe. He proved a skilful hunter and fighter,

and at length was made chief. The after-generation of aboriginals grew to venerate his name like that of a god, and the legends of his prowess are the subject of many of their corroborees.

In these lengthy ones which last for several nights, the preparations and staging are more elaborate. A spot is selected some distance from the camp, and a 'green-room' of boughs and bushes is erected to the right of the imaginary stage. When night falls the performers, who have spent the day arraying themselves, gather together in this structure, and await their turn expectantly. The audience assembles on the ground, the men seating themselves in front, and the women and dogs squatting behind. The native substitute for an orchestra is started by the men clashing their boomerangs together, and the women slapping their hands on their naked thighs.

The performers file on singly, the leading man always going first. As each man advances he is received with special shouts of applause, and comes to the front to make his acknowledgments. To the onlooker everything seems strangely suggestive of a civilised theatre. All the details are arranged with an ordered regularity which is not common among savage races. As the clashing of boomerangs ceases, the leading man takes up the first line of the chorus, which is repeated again and again by all the tribe.

It is characteristic of all the tales that they tend to be tragic. The aboriginals are on the whole distinctly a humorous people, but their humour is of a gay, light-hearted type, and finds little expression in their corroborees. The pathetic and the picturesque are the chief things that move them to artistic creation. These are the only things that they can adequately express in their national art. Here is the story of Bobbawinta, which is a typical example of a corroboree founded on a real incident. It is narrated in the reminiscences of Mr. T. Petrie :

Bobbawinta was a mighty hunter of turtle, far-famed among the tribes. He was young and strong, and his own tribe rejoiced in his prowess and skill. One day a party of men put out in boats to catch the turtles, which were plentiful on the coast. They were happy, and sang songs as they dragged their nets, for they knew there would be a big feast that night when they came home with their boats laden with spoil. Bobbawinta was especially merry, for this was the sport he loved, and he laughed and jested as he plied his oars. Presently a large turtle was sighted, and the boats quickly encircled it and entangled it in their nets. Quickly it dived to the bottom, and, being a huge monster, it plunged about till it had entangled the nets in some mangrove roots.

One by one divers were sent down to free the nets, but they all returned unsuccessful. There were shouts of joy when Bobbawinta at length plunged over the side, for their faith in him was great. As the seconds went by slowly, they could see the bubbles of air rise to the surface as he worked at the twisted nets. Presently no bubbles came, and they watched with anxiety, for several minutes had passed since he disappeared. Then a tinge of blood reddened the water, and the black fin of a shark was seen near by. At once there arose from the boats a passionate wailing over the fate of Bobbawinta, the much-loved.

The parts of action in such an one as this are rehearsed in silence,

with expressive gestures like the actors in a ballet, but sprinkled in among the scenes are little lyrical folk-songs. These are prolonged till they become a melancholy wail of repetition, but they are not without harmony. The audience works itself up into a half-hysterical intoxication with the music, the men rocking themselves about and keeping time with their boomerangs, and the women slapping their sides, or beating drums made of opossum skin.

These chants have a certain haunting charm even for the white man when he becomes accustomed to their peculiar cadences. Old bushmen prefer them to the popular tunes of the cities, and often pass their lonely hours in crooning them over by the camp-fire. There is something about the rhythm which appeals especially to children, and many a mother in the solitary bush has lulled her babies to sleep with the music of a corroboree chorus.

During the feast of the Bunya, that in the old days was held yearly in the ranges where the bunya-pines grew, many tribes assembled together. It was a time of excessive eating for those meat-fed natives, who rarely knew the taste of fruit from one season to another. In the evenings, however, after the day's indulgence, there was a grand rehearsal of corroborees, each tribe performing in turn before the gathering of strangers. It was then that any tribe which had invented new and striking songs shone out to advantage. The members of it were regarded with admiration greater than was ever accorded to victors in a fight.

Some tribes were renowned in this way for their folk-literature, just as certain civilised nations are renowned for their art. Others were notably barren, and looked with wonder at the corroborees performed by their neighbours. Often, if one tribal chief was particularly struck by a corroboree, he would approach the owners of it with a view of obtaining it for his own people. There would be an argument as to its value, and at length the rights would be surrendered for a few boomerangs, perhaps, or some skins.

In this way corroborees frequently travelled from the Arunta tribes of the central north many miles across the bush to the natives on the coast. Often one lasting several nights was acted by a people who knew not a word of its meaning. Yet they learnt the words of the songs, and reproduced them with a strict accuracy. Dr. Roth, one of the best known authorities on aborigines, took great pains to compare the corroboree reproduced by a foreign tribe with the original. The two tribes were many miles apart, but he got a member of each tribe to relate the words of some of the songs, and took a phonetic record in his note-book. After an elaborate comparison of the two, he came to the conclusion that the difference was trivial. This is an eloquent testimony to the powers of memory possessed by the aboriginal.

These few remarks may serve to introduce to the reader the art-

expression of a primitive and interesting people. The student of folklore will find in the corroboree tales the manifestation of a simple and striking vein of beauty. If he care for literary quality he will frequently get a glimpse of it in the legends and fantasies which have been preserved in the memories of the women and dreamers of the tribes. He will also gain an insight into the soul of the race more easily than by approaching along the dry and barren paths of the scientist.

E. VANCE PALMER.

THE LIMITS OF FIRE INSURANCE

WHEN the citizens of San Francisco were able to turn their thoughts from the present overwhelming disaster to the future rebuilding of their city, they probably for the first time discovered the necessary limitations of fire insurance. I say for the first time, because they must have been very different from the rest of the world if, until then, they had read their insurance policies at all. The perusal of these policies—those of them which are not burned or buried—must in many cases now give their possessors very little satisfaction. An earthquake, as a cause of fire, is an ‘act of God,’ against which fire insurance companies not unnaturally try to protect themselves, and in most countries fires arising from such a cause bring no liability upon fire offices. The principal exceptions to this rule are the United States and Canada, so that it happens that only three British fire offices in San Francisco had ruled out altogether the indirect as well as the direct consequences of earthquakes. There were, however, other important limitations in all the San Francisco fire insurances which will considerably reduce the amount of money which insurance companies here and in America will contribute towards the work of rebuilding. But it is hardly necessary to discuss these limitations in any detail, since most of my readers are only interested by sympathy in the great American disaster. It will be more profitable if we look at home, for in this country there are equally important limits in the insurance of property against fire of which quite extraordinarily little is known among even educated people. They arise naturally, almost inevitably, out of the principles on which fire insurance, for nearly two hundred years,* has been based. But it is not very wise to wait till a fire has occurred and a claim has to be made to learn what these limits are, especially as with a little timely knowledge most of the inconveniences or losses incidental to them may be lessened or removed.

Fire insurance in this country, and all over the world, is based on the common-law principle of pure indemnity—the principle that no one shall, if he can be prevented, make a profit out of a fire, that he shall recover only the amount of his actual material loss, and that the burden of establishing the fact and the extent of his loss

shall rest upon the person insured. The full severity of the common-law rule that no one is entitled to recover from an insurance company more than the actual amount of his proved loss is in practice tempered by concessions to genuine claimants, but it stands confronting anyone who attempts trickery or extortion. It will be seen that this principle or rule of indemnity, quite apart from any special conditions inserted in insurance policies, involves important limitations. In the first place it disestablishes the 'sum insured' from the lofty place which it occupies in a life or a marine insurance contract. In a fire insurance policy the sum insured merely marks the maximum liability accepted by the insurance company and determines the premium to be paid; it is not in any way admitted by the insurance office as a measure of the value of the property insured. If I have a life policy for 5,000*l.* and I die, my heirs can, on proof of death and their title, receive over the counter 5,000*l.* at least, possibly more if there are any 'bonuses.' If I have a ship and I insure her at Lloyd's or with marine insurance companies for 5,000*l.*, I can recover the full 5,000*l.* at once should my ship be totally lost. But if I insure my house against fire for 5,000*l.* I cannot recover 5,000*l.* unless it should happen that I can prove the house to be worth fully that sum. All that I am entitled to demand is the actual value of my house immediately before it was burned, and I must give every assistance to the insurance company in order that the actual value may be justly determined. By statute the insurance company has the power to reinstate that house (as far as the sum insured will go) instead of paying me anything, and third parties interested also have the right to call upon the insurance office to rebuild my house. In practice, compensation is usually agreed and paid in cash without recourse on either side to the right of reinstatement, but in no case am I entitled to more than the actual value of my house as it existed just before the fire. In other words, a life or accident policy is a contract to pay a definite sum in certain circumstances; a marine insurance policy is a contract to insure certain property—ships or cargoes—of which the values are agreed at the outset; but a fire insurance policy is a contract to indemnify the insured against such loss or damage as he may sustain, the extent of such loss or damage to be determined after a fire occurs. The chief reason for the important difference in principle between a marine and a fire policy springs from the difference in condition of property in transit and stationary property. Goods in transit are out of the control of the persons who effect the insurances upon them; goods in buildings on land are usually within that control. Then, again, the values of ships are readily determined by the published results of surveys (such as those of Lloyd's Register), while the values of buildings on land require separate and special surveys. Apart from the cost of such surveys, there is no particular reason why the values of buildings,

at any rate, should not be determined when fire insurances are taken out, and adjusted from time to time to allow for alterations or depreciation. But the public demand for insurance at the lowest possible premium, and the companies' fear of the 'moral hazard' of property entirely within the control of the persons insured, quickly led, early in the eighteenth century, to the adoption of the present system.

The limitations arising out of the principle of indemnity, increased as they are by specific policy conditions, are much more serious in the case of the contents of buildings than in regard to the buildings themselves. A building cannot be removed, so that the fact of loss is obvious and needs little proof, and its value is not difficult to settle even though it be totally destroyed. But contents are readily removed, and, in the absence of records, their true value is by no means easy to establish. Business firms which keep an exact account of their stock and its cost are in a different position, after a fire, from a private householder who has no inventory of his furniture and other property and, possibly, has not even the original bills. The burden of proving a loss rests on the claimant, and the disputes, which sometimes inevitably arise, are almost always due to the inability of the claimant to produce reasonable proof of loss. If householders would have an independent inventory made, say when they take and furnish a house, or subsequently if they like, and keep a careful record of all additions (with their cost) and also of all removals, they would then be able to produce trustworthy evidence should they suffer from a fire. The cost and trouble expended in these precautions would be more than repaid by the ease and completeness of the insurance settlement. There is a story that a man once claimed for the loss of 150 pairs of trousers, and when the number was struck out as preposterous he so bestirred himself in the collection of bills that he proved the loss, and drew the compensation for no less than 280 pairs! There may, therefore, be solid advantages in preserving even old tailors' bills.

Let me repeat that insurance offices are liable only for the actual value of goods destroyed or damaged; not the value when new, but at the time immediately before the fire. Evidence of first cost, while most useful in the case of furniture and other goods which more or less regularly depreciate in value, is of little weight in the assessment of loss or damage to pictures, curios, jewelry, and so on. Here the market value is highly variable, and depends rather on current taste than on anything commercially assessable. Money and securities, except while in transit, are not insurable on any terms, and valuables such as those mentioned are not covered by an ordinary fire policy. They must be specially insured, and no kind of insurance seems to me satisfactory to the owners which does not fix the values in advance. Suppose a man pays 3,000*l.* for a Constable at the top of a 'boom' in this painter. If he loses this picture from fire he

wants his outlay, at least, to be restored, and not be left to depend for compensation upon the fashion in Constables at the moment of the fire. Arrangements can be made for the insurance of pictures, jewelry, curios, china and so on, on the principle of fixed values, not of indemnity, and a large amount of business is done in this way, though some of the orthodox fire offices will not accept it. Experience does not show that the 'moral hazard' is at all incalculable—the risks of fraud are not great if ordinary prudent regard is shown to the position of the people insuring, and these risks, such as they are, are allowed for in the premium charged. All the pictures, relics, &c. exhibited at St. Louis or Milan, or temporarily placed in loan collections, are insured on the principle of fixed values.

A fire insurance policy is not only a contract of indemnity, it is also a personal contract. It is not an insurance on a building or on goods, but an indemnity to the person who insures the building or goods, and then only to the extent of what is called his 'insurable interest.' The doctrine that no one can effect a valid insurance on any property except to the extent of his genuine pecuniary interest in that property is common to all insurances, though marine underwriters and companies largely ignore it in practice. Marine policies covering a shipowner's hypothetical 'loss of freight,' and so on, in which proof of actual interest is waived, are common, but anything of the sort is practically unknown in fire insurance. Here the air is much more serene and legally purified. As the person who effects the fire insurance must have a definite insurable interest, it follows that he cannot insure any property unless it belongs to him or he is legally responsible for it, or he is interested in some other way—say as mortgagee. If he holds goods in trust for other people or on commission, he must have them specifically covered, since they will not be insured under an ordinary general fire policy. If he holds other people's property, without being legally responsible for it, this property must be insured by the actual owners, and not by the person holding it, or it will not be covered at all. If I sell a man goods out of my shop and undertake to deliver them, then, pending delivery, they will remain covered under my insurance policy because I am legally responsible for them. But if I sell a man goods out of my bonded warehouse, and they continue to lie in my warehouse to suit the convenience of the purchaser, then it is the purchaser's business to take out an insurance; my interest has ceased. Then, again, if I have contracted to sell my house, between the contract of sale and completion of the purchase there may be, and often is, a *hiatus* in the insurance protection unless the conditions in the insurance policy deal with the point or care is taken to secure protection. These questions in regard to insurable interest may seem complicated, but they arise naturally out of the personal nature of the fire insurance contract; it is the person who is insured, not the property, so that

as ownership or responsibility changes so must the insurance be changed. In practice there is little difficulty if the person who acquires an interest in any property will at once see that the insurance office concerned is informed of the change. In one important class of fire insurance policies some laxity is allowed. It is common for an insurance on one's furniture, &c., in one's dwelling-house to be extended to cover also the effects of servants or visitors which may be on the premises at the time of a fire; an omission to see that this provision is made in a furniture policy may have awkward consequences—especially as regards one's visitors!

I have already shown how the fire insurance policy is a contract of personal indemnity, and I must now carry it a step further, and deal with limitations of place and circumstance. A building, say, is in use for a particular purpose, and is equipped in a particular way. The owner takes out a fire insurance policy at an agreed rate of premium. Now, as that premium is based on the degree of fire risk incident to the particular building while in its present use, it is obvious that anything done to increase that risk, either by change in construction or in use, may invalidate the contract altogether. It follows that any change in construction or in use, just as in ownership or interest, must be immediately notified to the insurance office. It should be broadly understood that it is the business of insurance offices to insure, and that they desire for their own benefit to meet the convenience of their clients. In order that there may be unbroken harmony between the two parties to the contract, the person insured and the office, there should be the fullest good faith. It is far better to tell an insurance office too much than too little, both at the outset and during the currency of a policy.

The contents of buildings are removable, and within the complete control of the persons insured. But it should be clearly understood that an insurance policy is an indemnity strictly limited by place. The goods to be covered must be in the premises described in the insurance policy—or allowed by subsequent changes in the contract—either in one building (an ordinary insurance) or in two or more specified buildings (a floating insurance). If goods are removed, even though it may be temporarily to an adjacent building, then they will not be covered unless the adjacent building has been specified and allowed by the policy, or by endorsement on the policy. Here also it is only necessary for those taking out insurances to be clear and explicit as to what is wanted, and to understand what are the limitations of an ordinary policy. As in the matter of insurable interest, insurances on domestic furniture and other property in private houses are specially treated in regard to the right of removal. It is not necessary for a householder specially to insure his luggage when he goes for a holiday. Since the autumn of 1903 all fire insurance policies have contained a clause allowing the removal of articles of household

or personal use or ornament to any other private dwelling-house, club, lodging-house, or hotel in the United Kingdom where the insured may be staying, or to any bank or safe-deposit which is not part of a furniture depository. Property so removed will be held covered to the extent of 10 per cent. of the amount insured by the policy. In a similar way the contents of a coach-house, stabling, or harness-room may be temporarily removed to any other place of the same description in the United Kingdom; and will be covered while so removed. I am referring, of course, to ordinary fire insurance, and not to the numerous special contracts which may be taken out covering accidents from all sorts of causes to horses, carriages, motor-cars, &c.

The limitations of fire insurance arise in two ways: (1) From the common-law principle of personal indemnity for actual direct loss on which the whole contract is based; and (2) from the clauses or conditions expressed in the policies themselves. The first includes, to a large extent, the second, and is much the more important. Hence, curiously enough, it is much more important to understand fully the nature of the contract than to study the policies in close verbal detail. While reading clauses and conditions one may easily fail to see the wood for the trees. If, on the other hand, the principles are understood, then it will be seen that the greater part of the clauses and conditions in the policies merely give instructions to the insured, and provide machinery for carrying out in practice the principle of personal indemnity. In the absence of these expressed conditions, much delay and many disputes would certainly arise which are at present obviated, and their presence is a distinct advantage in most cases to persons insured. But, whether present or omitted, the principle of personal indemnity remains unaffected.

It happens, however, that some of the policy conditions go beyond mere interpretation or the setting up of machinery, and provide for the extension of the contract as well as for its limitation. The insured are given explicit rights which they would not have at common law, such as protection from damage done by lightning as well as from the explosion of coal gas in buildings other than gasworks. The concessions, mentioned above, as to the effects of visitors and servants in private dwelling-houses, and the removals of personal luggage, come within this category of extensions. But there are also limitations set up dealing with liability for fire damage caused by, or arising out of, certain events which need to be specially referred to.

No fire insurance policies issued in this country, and in most other countries, cover loss or damage caused by or happening through riots or civil commotions, foreign enemy, military or usurped power, or earthquakes. If such a disaster as that of San Francisco occurred here, the fire offices would have no liability either for earthquake or for fire damage caused by the earthquake. The reason for this

large exclusion is the incalculable nature of an earthquake and the damage which it may cause. Not only can no one calculate a premium to meet so vague a risk, but no human security can be provided which would not be scattered to fragments by a really widespread earthquake. We have seen the enormous fire losses—amounting to not less than 40,000,000%—arising out of earthquake in one American city. If the shock had spread far to several other important cities, as it might well have done, probably no fire insurance office, British, American, or European, would have been able to pay the claims upon it. The protection offered by fire insurance is an indemnity against ordinary accidental losses, and not one of the exclusions with which I am dealing is of the nature of an ordinary accident. Fire losses arising out of riots and civil commotions are ruled out practically everywhere. It is a liability of a State or municipality to protect its citizens from the effects of wide outbreaks of disorder, and, in this country, I believe, property-owners, in the event of loss through riots, have a remedy against the public authority which controls the police. If a country be invaded by an enemy, or a revolution takes place, the destruction might be stupendous—comparable even to that caused by an earthquake—and there would be no security that fire offices could pay even if they did not exclude the risks altogether. They properly exclude these risks. There is yet another exclusion applicable to some insurances—namely, damage caused by spontaneous combustion or heating. This is a very limited exclusion, since it relates only to the damage caused to the object which heats, and not to the damage caused to other property by a fire originally due to spontaneous combustion. Suppose there were a dozen haystacks and one heated, and that in consequence the whole batch was destroyed by fire. Then the loss on the original offending haystack which heated would be excluded, but the loss on all the other eleven innocent haystacks would be paid for by the insurance offices.

An ordinary fire insurance policy, such as most of my readers will possess, is, within its limits, a complete indemnity. That is to say, it is not 'subject to average,' and involves no obligation on the part of the insured to share losses with the insurance office. To some extent, of course, every fire insurance contract involves a sharing of loss, because, by the principle of pure indemnity, all indirect loss is thrown upon the person who suffers from the fire, and he has in addition to put up with much inconvenience for which no indemnity is offered. It is this undescribed and indefinite sharing of loss through a fire which tends to make people careful not to have fires. But in addition to this unexpressed, though implied, sharing of loss, there is, in mercantile contracts, a specific apportionment of loss between the person insured and the insurance office, and this apportionment is called the principle of 'average.' In essence the principle of average is most equitable, and there is little reason, except custom, why it should be

confined, as it is, to certain classes of insurance. The principle of average is this : when a property is insured for less than its real value (at the time of the fire), then the person insured shall share in any loss or damage in proportion to the amount which he elects to leave uninsured. If I have goods in a warehouse, which, at the time of a fire, are worth 10,000*l.*, and my insurance amounts to 8,000*l.* only, then I must pay (or lose) two-tenths of any fire damage, and the insurance company will be liable for eight-tenths only. The principle is a penalty on under-insurance, and leaves those who choose to under-insure to do so at their own risk. As the insurance office only receives premiums on the portion of the value insured, it declines to be liable for more than the *pro rata* portion of the damage done by a fire. A general application of the principle of average, or 'co-insurance,' to all fire policies would be much in the interests of the public, since at present those who pay the premium on, say, the full value of their dwelling-houses have to pay also to some extent for the deficiencies of the man next door who under-insures his house. In practice, however, as I have said, the average principle is only applicable to specified insurance contracts, those which are expressly described as being 'subject to average,' and is not of general application.

While there is some justice in the criticism that the orthodox system of fire insurance, as it is conducted in this country and all over the world, is inelastic, and in some respects inequitable ; it is arguable that no other system is suited to the peculiar conditions on which the business must be carried on. It is a business which is done in huge quantities 'over the counter,' so to speak, and the insurance companies know little or nothing of the character or position of the persons applying for insurance. Nothing but a rather rigid insistence on the principle of pure indemnity for actual loss or damage sustained can provide the necessary bulwark against carelessness and fraud, especially as the properties covered by the insurances are in most cases within the full control of the persons insured. It may also be contended on behalf of the system that its success—proved in all countries and based on the experience of two centuries—shows that it meets the needs of the public. Had any other been possible, commercially, there would have been no lack of energetic exponents. Even those companies and private underwriters who take up the classes of business refused by some of the orthodox offices—such as the insurance of pictures, jewelry, &c., at fixed values, and the insurance of 'loss of profits' arising out of fires—agree that large general fire insurance operations must be run on the present accepted lines of indemnity for direct losses. In support of this we have the solid uncontrovertible fact that fully 95 per cent. of the fire insurance business of the world is orthodox insurance. It is not in the least degree probable that in its main features there will be any fundamental change in principle as regards the great mass of the everyday fire

business, and there is no public demand, that I know of, for any such change. But here and there one sees possibilities of greater elasticity, more especially in regard to property out of the control of the insured. Goods in dock warehouses or in bonded stores might, if the owners desired, be insured on the basis of fixed values—as is done by marine companies—without any substantial sacrifice of principle or risk of incurring exceptional ‘moral hazard.’ Then, again, genuine contingent losses arising out of a fire—losses other than the material damage actually caused by the fire—might be more sympathetically treated. There is a big demand, a very natural and necessary demand, for protection against such losses, and there is also year by year a growing amount of such insurances being placed outside the ranks of the regular orthodox fire offices. Such insurances can be based on a system which is true to the main principle that no one must be allowed to make a profit out of a fire. If, say, the run of a successful piece at a theatre is stopped by a fire, the actual loss to the producer and to the writer of the piece is not measured by the material damage to scenery and theatrical furniture. But any compensation which may be allowed for contingent losses—losses of profits—must be based on the principle of indemnity and proved by the actual earnings at the time of the fire, or a whole field is opened for mere wager insurances, or for making insurance offices pay for unsuccessful ventures.

No criticism of insurance principles is sound which does not take into account the interests of the community as well as those of insured persons and of insurance companies. The public interest demands that fires should be prevented as far as possible, and their occurrence made inconvenient to those who suffer from them. The loss caused by every fire is a dead loss; no recovery of that loss is possible. All that insurance companies do is to spread the loss over a wide area. As the community as a whole must lose by every fire, whoever pays for it, any institutions which by their system or by their rules make fires inconvenient and enforce precautions against them are doing a great, almost inestimable, public service. And there is no doubt at all that the fire insurance offices have, by their system of indemnity and by their collective efforts—call them a ‘ring,’ if you please,—done more to keep down fires, and to preserve property from loss, than all the efforts, for generations, of legislatures and municipalities. The consistent, even remorseless, penalising of bad risks, bad construction and equipment, and the concessions in respect of lower premiums to good risks, good construction and equipment, enforced year after year and generation after generation, have brought about in this country an immense reduction in the fire risks and improvement in building. A system free from limitations, a system which would insure anything and everything provided that people ‘would pay the rates,’ a system which would allow values to be fixed in advance

without inquiry and would thus permit wagering in insurance—such a system could never have deserved well of the public, however much fraudulent or careless owners of property might have found it convenient. It is, indeed, by those very features which, with thoughtless people, have caused unpopularity, that the British fire offices have most surely earned the gratitude and goodwill of the community at large.

F. HARCOURT KITCHIN.

THE WATCHING OF THE MYRRH

It was Old Christmas Eve ; there were seven of us, and a lantern. It wanted but twenty minutes to midnight, and the night was lit only by the stars when we started on our mysterious errand. What was it ? Not burglary, for the lantern was not a dark lantern ; not the crime of the wrecker (though the coastline is suggestive of such a purpose), for our lantern was willingly lent us by the cox of the lifeboat, who is naturally the mariner's best friend ; not raiding the neighbours' gardens, for we have many a time visited them by daylight and acquired by gift or purchase samples of all that is therein. The composition of our little party, too, forbids any theory of serious crime—four girls of assorted sizes, large and small (one, at least, very small to be out of bed at such an hour), a college boy reading for the Church, myself, and my faithful old cat, who follows everywhere at my heels—these made up the seven. But what *were* we going to do at that dead hour of the night ? We were in expectation—the younger of us, at any rate, in expectation—of being witnesses to a modern miracle ; for we went to take part in the time-honoured custom of the ' Watching of the Myrrh.'

' The Watching of the Myrrh,' be it explained to the reader who is not an antiquary, is one of the ancient customs associated in old-world tradition with Christmas Eve. Still, in out-of-the-way places, where ancient usage lingers, the Christmas Eve of the New Calendar—that New Calendar now so old that most of us have half-forgotten that there was ever any other—has not wholly supplanted the Christmas Eve of the Old Style. This, when we remember it at all, we hold distinguished by the name of Twelfth Night, because it is twelve days after the earlier date of the New Style. On the Old Christmas Eve, says tradition in the Isle of Man, strange things happen. At midnight two-year-old cattle go on their knees ; and the bees, at other times silent in their winter sleep, fly out of the hive in a busy swarm. Strangest of all, the myrrh, plant of miracle, rises up and flowers in a single night. Between the hours of twelve and one on Old Christmas Eve the myrrh—which is at first only a small bud, scarcely if at all peeping above the soil—rises, expands, spreads

its leaves, and bursts at last into miraculous bloom. The whole garden, moreover, is filled with its sweet scent, as though the plant had felt the cold and darkness of the winter midnight exchanged for the warmth and brightness of a summer noon.

And all these things are so, in memory of a night in Bethlehem when kine paid homage on their knees, and kings from afar brought gifts of myrrh. So says the tradition of the olden time. Therefore should good people spend the midnight hour in watching that these wonders may be known to mortal eyes. Such, accordingly, has been from time immemorable the custom in the Isle of Man.

Myrrh, according to the prosaic writers of a modern day, is the product of a tree not capable of growth in our cold and northern clime; but this fact did not in the least trouble the simple-minded country folk of past days. They found an aromatic plant that *does* grow in our climate, and that was good enough for them. The plant traditionally known in the Isle of Man as 'the myrrh' may be seen there in old-fashioned gardens. It is only an old root from an old-fashioned garden, say the people, that sends up shoots on Old Christmas Eve. New roots, in newly planted gardens, somehow fail to conform to the custom, and, though watched carefully, are watched in vain. Nor is it of any avail to watch the oldest of old roots in the oldest of old gardens if the date chosen be the *new* Christmas Eve! But what if, when all the above requisites are fulfilled, the myrrh flower should still fail of making its appearance? Then, say the elders, the obvious conclusion is that this particular plant is not of the genuine species of myrrh. And who shall gainsay the opinion of old folk? For when were old folk ever short of an argument in matters pertaining, however remotely, to the province of theology? In my neighbour's garden lies a root of 'myrrh,' large and spreading, the growth of many years. The garden is old—no one now living remembers when it was not there. This is the true and genuine myrrh, hallowed by memories of the past. And if this should fail us, across the way there is another old root of myrrh, in another old garden. Well do I remember the old man who used to tend it in the days when first I knew the place. Tradition—more reliable, probably, in this instance than in the legend of the myrrh—gave him an ancestry among the Huguenot refugees in this far island of the sea. Forty years ago his voice led the village choir—a choir guiltless of instrumental music, except for the occasional use of an old fiddle. To-day, in the same parish, his grandson plays a good organ in a new church. Let those who, wearied of commonplace, would go seeking for a miracle, turn from the world of flowers to the world of human life. For the living root of genius, planted in the soil of honesty, and tended with industry, will renew its growth generation after generation, even in the winter of adversity and on the bleakest shore.

And now it is midnight, and we scan carefully the spot where the

precious plant lies hid. Two little, conical buds, a foot apart, and each scarcely a fifth of an inch high, are the sole indications of our treasure. We set the lantern down hard by, and keep ourselves warm by pacing up and down the little garden; the children run by turns to our hostess's hospitable fire; and pussy, from a point of vantage on the wall, scans all our proceedings with a critical eye. The night is still and cold, and the lantern burns brightly in the quiet air.

A quarter past twelve, and our plant is still the same. I recall the first time that I took part in the 'Watching of the Myrrh.' On this occasion we went, like Jack and Jill, up a hill—the Howe, as the country folk call it, as if there were no other Howe (hill, *i.e.*) in all the world. The night was dark and rainy; yet, unlike Jack and Jill, we came down again without accident, probably owing to the fact that a prudent and self-sacrificing member of the party undertook the task of carrying a lantern—a boat's lantern, warranted to be visible at a distance of two miles, and bright enough to guide even the most careless steps in safety. Did we get the myrrh? Yes, we did. But when exactly it arose, and how far it had made progress towards blossom, who plucked it, and whether they did or did not grub it up with a pocket-knife, I will not undertake to say.

Half-past twelve and no change. We note the stars to pass the time. We recall to each other the day when we saw this little garden assailed by raging seas, its wall broken down, and potatoes with the soil they grew in carried away bodily by the waves. Then the sea rose in mountains; to-night it lies still and calm. We slip over to the other garden to see how the myrrh there is getting on. Here are buds an inch high; but, then, they were there the day before.

A quarter to one. The younger members of our party feel sure that our two buds are larger. Then there are certainly others coming—one, two, three. These are where they have patted the soil with their fingers.

One o'clock. We are not going to give up in despair. Sometimes, say the traditions of the place, the myrrh, slow in rising, yet flowers before the dawn of day.

A quarter past one. Our youngsters are still more sure that the plant makes some progress. Pussy comes down and examines it most attentively.

Half-past one. The buds, so often patted, are certainly a little farther out of the ground. We must watch more steadily. Pussy sits down, evidently with a firm intention to do so. (It is warmer, by the way, on the ground close to the lantern than on the wall.)

A quarter to two. We visit the second plot of myrrh, and try to keep awake. The youngsters are quite sure that the myrrh in our plot is rising, but are not so certain about that in the other garden.

Two o'clock. We acknowledge ourselves beaten. Bed is the

place of all others most desirable, whatever miracles meanwhile take place elsewhere. We say 'Good-bye,' promising to come again by daylight and see what progress the myrrh has made.

Turning round the corner from the house, our sleepy senses are roused by a sudden alarm. What is this bright light shining over the long spit of land that juts out into the sea? It is three miles away, a wild and rocky place where scattered lonely farmsteads look upon the shore. What is this light, and how about the hayricks and late standing cornstacks of our friends over there across the bay? It is only the other day that they fed the thrashing-mill with one of them, whereof at harvest time I helped (or hindered) in the making; and there were others standing. We rush back to the house of the myrrh. We know they have a field-glass through which we might see the distant fire. 'Fire?' says our hostess, with indignant laughter. 'Why, *that's* the rising moon!' And so it is, rising above the long, low hill—a single horn, red and fiery, of the crescent moon. But we were so sleepy—so sleepy, indeed, that if we had stayed much longer we should not only have taken the rising moon for a fire, but also should have been easily convinced of the rising of the growing myrrh. We understand quite well now, from personal experience, why the tradition has been confirmed by generation after generation of sleepy watching of the myrrh.

We wake ourselves up with our laughter, and trot briskly homeward, cat and all. The fire is warm and red, and we finish the evening as we began it—with cakes, and apples, and nuts. Then two bold spirits repent them that they have given way to cold and slumber, and forsaken the quest of the myrrh. They will go back and search again. The youngsters and the cat are by this time snoozing peacefully on the hearthrug. Our adventurous spirits are away for full half an hour. When they return they are quite, quite sure it is coming! It will be up by daylight, not a doubt.

It was not, perhaps, the earliest of daylight that greeted my eyes next morning when I was aroused by shouts of triumph. 'We've got it! We've got it, flower and all!' And, sure enough, so they had! Three inches long, as near as may be, with several green leaves and a large white flower-bud. The treasure, placed in a teacup in my sunny window, lasted a fortnight, and the tiny flowerets of the head of blossom showed each of them five white petals, plainly to be seen. And yet there are unbelievers who say that the age of miracles is past!

Alas! that I must tear away the veil of illusion and let in the light of common day. To begin with, the hallowed myrrh is neither more nor less than a plant much resembling aniseed in appearance and in odour. This plant, myrrh, so named, I think, by botanists on account of this northern tradition, is much like celery in its growth, and forms a stout winter bud deep down in the soil; and at the turn

of the year this bud, like that of the crocus or the snowdrop, is ready to peep above the ground. We are apt to associate the idea of a 'bud' with the spring, because in spring the buds open; but nature prepares them long before. On many trees, for instance, the buds that are to be opened next spring are found already formed, not only by autumn, but even in the summer of the year before. And some of these long-standing buds contain, already fully formed in the winter, not only leaves, but also flowers. Such, also, is often the case with the bud of the myrrh. I am inclined to think that other kindred plants are sometimes called upon to play the part of the 'myrrh'; but for these also the same explanation holds good.

Already, by the 6th of January, if the season be at all mild, the buds of the myrrh are peeping above the ground. The top only is visible, but several inches of bud lie below, and may be laid bare by clearing away the mould. A very little scraping of eager feet, a very little grubbing of curious hands, will therefore soon bring to light several inches of the plant. The shoot, when pulled apart, reveals both leaf and flower; and, since the whole plant is aromatic, and betrays its presence if only slightly bruised, the scent, adduced by simple folk as evidence of a winter miracle, is more than easily to be explained. Add to this, also, the word of warning given us by a farmer and churchwarden—churchwardens, by the way, are apt to be critical in matters of belief. The Manx country folk, when they talk of the flower of a plant, as likely as not mean a shoot or sprout. Thus the 'flower' of a potato has come up when it shows green. When the plant bears its flower they will call that the blossom. Therefore, if a country fellow seeks the 'flower' of the myrrh, he will be quite satisfied if he gets green leaves. Hence the number of witnesses who have seen the myrrh in flower at Christmas, persuaded out of the mould of the garden bed by means of no agency more supernatural than their own hands. This is the whole of the secret; and yet I am told that there are a few people still alive at the present day who fully believe in the miraculous sprouting of the myrrh. As for those who 'watch' for it for the sake of keeping up old customs, do they believe in the miracle? Not a bit of it! But with Celtic love of a joke they will make pretence to do so, and will bring home with a solemn face the 'miraculous' shoot of myrrh which they have found after a little grubbing in the soil.

But if we have made an end of the miracle of the 'myrrh' by this simple explanation, there is yet something to be added regarding the origin of the belief. All these legends, both that of the myrrh and its accompanying stories regarding the cattle and the bees, are of Scandinavian origin. They may be traced in other parts of the British Isles; but in the Isle of Man they seem to have survived undisturbed from the days when its Norse conquerors raised those Runic crosses which still exist to delight the student of history. The

legend of the myrrh is doubtless, like the use of the mistletoe, one of the many instances in which the rites of an ancient mythology have been utilised as the ornaments of a Christian festival. The early appearance of the buds, with their precocious preformed flowers, was doubtless marked by the wise men of the northern nations, and associated in their minds with 'the turn of the year,' while yet they worshipped Odin, and had never heard of Christian creeds. Nay, long ages before Odin was worshipped, the plant took part possibly in the rites of an older creed, embodying the worship of the seasons of the year, and was revered because the appearance of its buds, just after the winter solstice, welcomed the lengthening hours of daylight and gave witness to the daily increasing power of the sun.

B. LINDSAY.

A VETERAN'S VIEW OF THE EDUCATION • CONTROVERSY

THE introduction of the subject of education into the political arena is an unfortunate incident for its own highest interests. In the first place, it deals with subjects on which the man in the street thinks himself quite as competent to judge and quite as much entitled to pronounce an opinion as the statesman in his cabinet or the professor in his lecture-room. Even if we bear this point in mind, the number of proposals in relation to Mr. Birrell's Bill is simply amazing. I speak with feeling, for the name of the proposals submitted to me in one form or another for private opinion or public judgment has been legion. I am a worn-out veteran, deeply interested, but taking no active part in the fray. I tremble to think what must have been the pressure on the unfortunate Minister who is at its centre. Of course, the great multitude of these suggestions can be summarily disposed of, but we cannot so easily get free from the confusion of thought they cause. It is hardly possible to give a hint even about matters of very subordinate importance without its being an opening for all kinds of proposals in relation to it, and, unfortunately, the more insignificant the point the fiercer the heat with which it is too often discussed. As the result, matters of detail are elevated into questions of principle. If it happens to be some Unionist who insists upon one view, there are Liberals or Nonconformists who think it necessary at once to offer uncompromising opposition, and the same holds good on the other side. The discussions on the Bill in Committee have only too often reminded me of the assembly at Ephesus, where 'some cried one thing, and some another: for the assembly was in confusion; and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together.'

All this is unfortunate enough; but the situation has been complicated by the introduction of mere party tactics into a subject which ought to have been kept entirely free from them. Of course, from the moment that it was recognised that the work of the schools could not be restricted to secular instruction, this became inevitable. The speeches of the Bishops on the introduction of Mr. Birrell's measure gave to the controversy a still more political character, which

the moderation of later utterances has not been able to remove. The Bill has up to this point been the principal scheme of the Ministry, and, as a necessary consequence, the controversy has become more and more political both in spirit and in character. It is unfortunate, but it was inevitable. The evil has been increased by the freedom of observation in which some Lobby correspondents have indulged. As the result, some of the most important questions have been imperfectly touched, while mere trifles have been elevated to an importance to which certainly they are not entitled.

The whole history of the contest has been by no means edifying. It opened with a fierce outburst of Episcopal anger. Its original violence was to some extent moderated in subsequent utterances, but with the majority it would seem as though the opposition was still as uncompromising as ever. The wisdom of taking this attitude may be doubted, but there is no just reason to complain of the severest criticism, provided only it be conducted with sweet reasonableness. That quality, unfortunately, is one which in many cases seems to have been quietly dismissed from the dispute. The air was filled with charges of confiscation, which, despite all their experiences of political warfare, must greatly have astonished the ears even of the Ministry themselves. The misfortune of such a mode of warfare is that it not only makes the strife itself more bitter, but that it tends to confuse the issues at stake. In the present case, *e.g.*, the fiercest passions have been awakened in relation to points which have no real existence. The idea of confiscation has been prominent in speech, but is simply ludicrous. The Ministry, in truth, would hardly have been allowed to find a comfortable resting-place even on the Opposition Benches, to say nothing of retaining their present position, had their first proposal been to deprive the Anglican Church of its property in schools which were the standing and expressive monuments of its devotion to the cause of Christian education and the children of England. But though the Primate and some of the Bishops have moderated the tone of their first denunciations, there are others of them who still maintain the same attitude and make the same charge. The Bishop of Manchester is the conspicuous example. The march of the Manchester men, which he organised apparently with the view of impressing the country and the Government, fell little short of the farcical. There is a constitutional way in which the people of Manchester can express their views on the education question, and they have done it with clear and emphatic voice. No effort was spared by the Bishop and his friends to present the claims of their schools in the demonstration on the night before the election in January; but the appeals were made in vain, for the next night saw Manchester represented by a solid phalanx of Liberals. The whole story only serves to illustrate the peril into which ecclesiastics may fall if they condescend to the arts of political

agitation. There is a well-known saying—a very untrue one, as I venture to think—that all things are fair in politics, as in love and war. Assuredly the political platform too often echoes to statements which cannot be justified, and which excite passions that are altogether unfriendly to a wise and judicial settlement.

But if the maxim were really sound it would be a sufficient reason for keeping religion and politics absolutely apart. The mistake lies here. They deal with two spheres whose laws are entirely distinct. Here, indeed, is the characteristic feature of this entire episode. It would be hard to be severe on those who have succeeded only to a heritage of difficulty. The different parties have for the last few years been playing at cross-purposes, and this cry of 'confiscation' and cognate complaints have come out of the confusion. It is foolish to be very angry about them, though they are exasperating enough to those who ask that popular institutions should be controlled by the popular vote. It is not wonderful that those who have regarded certain privileges as their rightful inheritance should esteem their withdrawal as an act of injustice. But Nonconformists are not trying to secure some countervailing advantages for themselves. They are simply asking for justice all round. There is not the slightest evidence that the Anglican Church will be a penny the poorer. If it loses anything it will be some sectarian privilege to which no Church is entitled. The advocates of these broad measures of national equity are not in any sense its enemies. It is probably idle for any Nonconformist to assert that he is opposed, not to the Anglican Church *per se*, but simply to the usurpation by the State of any authority in matters of religion. But that is true of numbers of us. We are not insensible to the work which the Anglican Church has done, nor do we believe that there must necessarily be antagonism between it and Free Churches. On the contrary, we believe that the time for these offensive distinctions is rapidly passing away, and that the day is not far distant when the servants of Christ will feel that One is our Master, even Christ, and all we are brethren, and that no State has any right to set up distinctions amongst us.

Meanwhile, it is desirable in a great national discussion like this for each party to try to understand the aims of its opponents. It may be very difficult for parties occupying such positions as members of the State Church on the one side, and Free Churchmen on the other, thoroughly to understand each other's case. Nonconformists, at all events, are justified in complaining of the misrepresentation of their entire attitude, which has been so marked. The Bill itself has been described as a Nonconformist measure, and one which has been directed against the Church. Again and again has Mr. Balfour insisted that it is a direct attack upon the Anglican Church, and inspired by a desire to weaken its position and influence. In a certain sense it is true that its ideal cannot be worked out without a curtailment of some of the advantages which an Established Church enjoys.

Possibly Mr. Balfour may have convinced himself that the Bill of 1902 dealt as liberally with Dissenters as with Churchmen, but it is extremely doubtful whether he has succeeded in inducing any others to accept his view. It would be a mere trifling to reopen this question now. I have not been a Passive Resister, and, indeed, have from the beginning expressed my dissent from that particular mode of warfare; but when I have heard the pitiful sneers directed against passive resistance as a cheap and pretentious form of martyrdom, I have felt something of the spirit which stirred Sheil in that memorable passage in which he hurled back Lord Lyndhurst's insults against Irishmen when he called them aliens in blood, race, language, and religion, and have been ready to cry out 'Hold!-' I know these sufferers for conscience sake. Theirs is no mere lip service, still less is it a piece of miserable acting for ambition's sake. I differ from their judgment, but I am assured of their integrity, and I respect their devotion. Of course the Liberal Government, which Free Churchmen had done so much to place in power, was bound to remove this crying injustice. But Mr. Balfour would do well to remember what his persistent endeavours to represent this as a blow dealt at the Church really mean. They are, in truth, a confession that the Bill of 1902 was a concession of privilege by his Government to the Establishment. As a matter of fact, there is no reasonable pretence for dragging in the question of the Establishment at all. The Bill is a simple endeavour to carry out the principle of political justice in our educational system. If this be to aim a blow at the Church, so much the worse for the Church. It can only be because the Church has been placed in an invidious position of privilege. No doubt the present Bill goes beyond the correction of the unfairness of that of 1902, but that is almost a necessary consequence. If the compromise of 1870 had been left untouched, it is in every way improbable that any such change would have been proposed now. The late Ministry may congratulate themselves upon having supplied the momentum necessary to secure so decided an advance. They took advantage of a factitious majority, gained for entirely different purposes, to confer a benefit upon their clerical supporters; and now, when a Liberal Government seeks to work out the true ideal of national education, their proposals are described as a blow at the Church.

An equally unprofitable and misleading discussion has arisen about the special provisions for the religious instruction in the Council schools. It might have been supposed that the history of Nonconformist Churches in this country would have been sufficient to preserve them from the statement that undenominationalism is their religion. I have been accustomed to think that the faults imputed to Dissenters were of an entirely opposite character, and that they were generally assumed to be too tenacious about small differences, and too schismatic in asserting them. The normal type of Dissenter has again and again been described to me as that of John and Jennie,

who separated and separated until they became a denomination of their own, and then Jennie suspected the orthodoxy of John. Now it seems as though the man who has no dogmas, and cares nothing about them, is the truest type of Dissenter. The criticisms which have been passed upon us, all based on this view, have often been irritating because of their essential injustice. There are, no doubt, those who answer to this description. But to suggest that simple Bible teaching means the absence of dogma, and that that is the Nonconformist's creed, is a suggestion which is as ludicrous as it is unjust. I have, however, myself met with so many earnest Churchmen for whom I have the profoundest respect, who clearly hold this view with perfect sincerity, that I feel constrained to examine it a little more fully. It is perhaps well at the beginning to remind my readers that the Cowper-Temple compromise was not a Nonconformist movement. If this be, as is often said, a new Nonconformist religion which the Government is about to establish in all Council schools, it is, to say the least, strange that the names of two loyal and devoted Churchmen should be so closely connected with it. Mr. Cowper-Temple was its author; Mr. W. H. Smith was one of its principal sponsors in the London School Board. Both of them were zealous members of the Anglican Church. The ideal of Joseph Lancaster, to which this country owed so much, hardly differed at all from that of the much maligned Cowper-Temple clause. Nonconformists undoubtedly had largely accepted it and worked on it prior to the Education Bill of 1870. But to represent it as setting forth a Nonconformist creed is a mere perversion of fact. What it really does mean is that the religious teaching of children should deal simply with those broad principles of faith on which Christians are agreed, and should leave the discussion of the differences between Churches to the time when they are more capable of judging for themselves.

What are the real points of difference between undenominationalism — 'the hated and abhorred thing,' as it is continually called — and its rival? It certainly is not the great question which has sometimes divided the Churches, which still separates Calvinists and Arminians. I have yet to learn of the first instance in which any Board School has sought to inculcate the views either of the one side or the other. An attempt has been made, and somewhat persistently carried on, to represent undenominationalism as excluding the entire doctrinal teaching of the Bible, and confining itself simply to literary and ethical teaching. There are undoubtedly those who hold this view consistently, and who are eloquent in their eulogies of the intellectual advantages of the reading of the Holy Scriptures in our schools. I fully agree in their statements; I sympathise with their admiration; I absolutely dissent from their conclusions. If the Bible is to be read in our schools simply as a great work of English literature, I would rather it were excluded altogether. After all, bare secularism is better than an outward homage to the Bible, which involves the

ignoring of its real character as the one revelation from God. To Christians in general the Bible is precious as containing the message that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. Undoubtedly there are those who take an opposite view, and it is not for us to judge them. If they contend that the State has no right to give any preference to either of these views over the other, I frankly confess it. I go even further and admit that there are comparatively few who realise the difficulties of securing a real instruction in what are to us these essentials of the faith without violating the consciences of those who dissent from them. I am bound in honour to add that this minority has never pressed its objections, and that they may therefore have been sometimes too much ignored. It is curious, indeed, to note the difference between the treatment accorded to Unitarians and Roman Catholics. The history of the last thirty years, however, has made it abundantly manifest that for the latter exceptional treatment must be granted under any system except that which forbids the interference of the State with religious teaching altogether. Unitarians have been zealous workers in the cause of education, and have never insisted on any special grievance of their own. Hostile critics will probably say that is because the Cowper-Temple teaching is practically their own.

But it may safely be predicted that when this struggle is over, and excited disputants are taking a more rational view of the situation, the bitter maledictions which have been heaped upon a system which, despite all statements to the contrary, has, of course with some exceptions, worked remarkably well, will be keenly regretted. Curses of this kind often come home to roost, and in the struggle with unbelief the fiery language of clerics, and among them even Bishops, will be quoted against the Bible itself. The violent and unscrupulous character of the attacks made upon the Government and this provision of its Bill in particular has been one of the worst features of the recent discussions. Exaggeration is common in political discussion. It is peculiarly mischievous when some religious point is the centre round which the fight gathers. At the same time it is both absurd and unfair to lampoon this religious earnestness as though there were some reproach resting upon those by whom it was indulged. On both sides it is a sign of the extreme value which is attached to religion itself. The action of conscience is often unintelligible to mere spectators, but it is simple weakness on the part of observers to ridicule that which they do not comprehend. Surely it is the part of a sensible man to understand and respect the conscience of another as much as to claim respect for his own.

In reading the discussions, however, on the Education Bill, and especially in relation to this much-abused Cowper-Temple teaching, a question which continually presents itself is whether the critics have really weighed the language which they employ. Here is Lord Hugh Cecil in one of his latest utterances saying: 'The

Church of England regards the tendency of the operations of the Cowper-Temple clause as hostile to her teaching, and ultimately subversive of Christianity.' Has his lordship ever considered what the teaching is on which he utters this unqualified condemnation? If a proposal had been made that the children should be taught the sacred books of Mohammed or of Buddha, or the teachings of Confucius, he could hardly have branded it with more emphatic reprobation, 'Ultimately subversive of Christianity.' He is rivalled in his maledictions by a clergyman who writes in relation to his county syllabus: 'This is the infidel "canned meat" that is to be provided in future for all the children of the flock of Christ in substitution for the bread of heaven, with which hitherto so many thousands of them have been nourished.' It is well that the reader should remember as he runs through these words that this 'infidel canned meat' is neither more nor less than simple Bible teaching.

It is not the safety of the Bill which is endangered by such attacks as these. It is, what is far more important than any Bill or any party, the authority of the Bible itself. When the controversy has become nothing more than a memory, are not such words almost certain to be recalled in the heat of the perpetual discussion over the claims of Christianity which goes on from age to age? The Bible itself has inspired a faith which forbids those who love it to despair of its future, but assuredly such extraordinary utterances as these—and, alas! it would be possible to quote only too many of them—can only serve the cause of unbelief. Verily religion itself is wounded in the house of its friends. It is needless to repeat that I am not arguing thus because I approve the forcing of this system upon our schools. I quote it simply as an additional proof of the immense difficulty inseparable from any proposal for religious instruction in the schools. But it is necessary on every account to do justice to the system itself, and for this reason alone it is not possible to pass such attacks over *sub silentio*. There is abundant evidence that a large number even of liberal-minded Churchmen have had the impression that the Free Churches desire teaching from which every doctrinal element is excluded. It would certainly be very hard to obtain it, but the great effort should be to fulfil the ideal of an utterly colourless religion. I was recently present at the discussion of this subject at two private conferences, at which some distinguished members of the Anglican Church, including two Bishops, met some representative Nonconformists in the most informal way. The question arose as to what was really intended by undenominational teaching, and I ventured to express the opinion that it might safely be described as represented either by the Apostles' Creed or the *Te Deum*. It was not the first time that I had expressed this opinion, and I was speedily confirmed in it by various Nonconformist brethren in the company. There was, of course, our fundamental objection to the formulation of any creed beyond that of the simplest belief in Christ

as the foundation of Christian fellowship. But as to the acceptance of the teaching of the Apostles' Creed there was none. Of course, as to the one clause, 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church,' there would be a diversity of view, but not one involving any essential antagonism of Christian principle. Nothing surprised me more, however, than the manifest satisfaction and relief with which the earnest and liberal Anglicans who were present received the statement. Letters which I have since received indicate that this was no momentary feeling, and suggest that the basis of a settlement may be found in the recognition of this fact. Here is our answer to the extraordinary allegation of Lord Hugh Cecil, who tells us that the Cowper-Temple teaching is 'properly described as a new religion' because it 'differs from historic Christianity by rejecting the conception of sin as an active evil.' I read this in simple wonderment. That certainly would be a strange mode of reading the Bible which left its pupils without any sense of sin as an active evil. His lordship may safely dismiss his fears upon this score. This is pressing even the hypothetical type of objection to a remarkable extent. What it really means is that the Bible is not to be trusted in the schools unless there be the voice of the Church to interpret it. The time has long since passed when the people of England were likely to accept such a theory as this with patience or submission. In his own Church are multitudes of able and devoted men, who are prepared to contend as earnestly as any Nonconformists that the Bible, and the Bible only, is their religion.

I am compelled, however, to admit that the establishment of this new system in our provided schools all over the country does involve an important surrender on the part both of the Anglican Church and its clergy. They have been accustomed to regard their authority, in the villages at all events, as supreme. They have now to learn that the people are to control their own schools, and it is tolerably certain they will do it in a very independent spirit. The first two clauses of the Bill are a remarkable concession, not to Nonconformist ambition, but to civic justice. Clause IV. is a concession to denominationalism. The more broad and liberal the spirit, the more generous the temper, and the more ungrudging the endeavour to do complete justice on the part of the Nonconformists, the better for all the greatest interests concerned. We have had too many small grievances aired and petty quibbles started. Is not the time come when we can take the opportunity that offers, and strive to make our schools the glory of our people and the admiration of the world?

J. GUINNESS ROGERS.

The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY cannot undertake to return unaccepted MSS.

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
AND AFTER



No. CCCLV—SEPTEMBER 1906

LE PANGERMANISME, LA HOLLANDE
ET LA BELGIQUE

I.—LES PORTS DU RHIN

CETTE REVUE en appelant l'attention de ses lecteurs sur *the Absorption of Holland by Germany* a rendu service, non seulement à ses compatriotes, mais aux hommes de tous les pays qui pensent à l'avenir de l'Europe.

On peut les diviser en deux catégories : les uns veulent que les peuples libres puissent évoluer chacun selon leurs mœurs et leur caractère en conservant leur hégémonie ; les autres entendent qu'il y ait au centre de l'Europe un pouvoir central dont les autres États ne seraient que les subordonnés. Toutes les nations sauf l'Allemagne sont intéressées à la politique qui assurera la première solution.

Comme l'a fait ressortir, dans son article, M. J. Ellis Barker et comme le prouve un coup d'œil jeté sur une carte, l'Empire d'Allemagne a, au point de vue de la mer, une fâcheuse configuration. Il a bien un développement de 900 kil. de côtes sur la mer Baltique ; mais la mer Baltique est un lac fermé par des détroits d'un passage

difficile et presque chaque hiver bloqué par les glaces. Dans ce lac elle a trois ports de guerre : Koenisberg, Dantzig, Kiel. Pour assurer les communications de ce dernier arsenal avec la mer du Nord il a fallu creuser le Kaiser Wilhelm canal, long de 63 milles, d'une profondeur de 30 pieds et d'une largeur au plafond de 72 pieds.

Mais sur la mer du Nord de Cuxhaven, à l'embouchure de l'Elbe, à Emden, la côte qui se compose de plaines basses protégées par des digues, n'a à vol d'oiseau qu'environ 80 milles. Les deux ports Hambourg et Brême sont enfoncés dans les terres si bien que, dès 1828, Brême a complété le sien par Bremerhaven et que les grands paquebots de Hambourg rattachent leurs chargements qu'à Cuxhaven. Il suffit d'un coup de vent pour faire des dénivellements de l'Elbe, au-dessous de Hambourg, de plus d'un mètre.

Sur cette côte il n'y a qu'un port de guerre, Wilhelmshafen, dont l'accès n'est maintenu qu'à force de dragages.

Certes les ports de Hambourg et de Brême ont reçu un très grand développement depuis leur annexion à l'empire en 1889.

Mais le mouvement industriel de l'Allemagne se porte de plus en plus à l'ouest le long du Rhin. M. Ellis Barker a rappelé avec raison le tableau qui, affiché à l'exposition de Dusseldorf, indiquait triomphalement l'importance de la Westphalie et de la Province Rhénane dans la monarchie prussienne. Un territoire de 1,000 milles carrés à partir de Cologne, ayant pour places frontières München, Gladbach, Crefeld, Dortmund, Iserlohn, Remscheid, Dusseldorf, contient 3,000,000 d'habitants et les plus grands établissements industriels de l'empire. Sur le Rhin les ports de Ruhrort, Duisburg et Hochfeld ont un mouvement de marchandises de plus de 10,000,000 de tonnes.

On peut dire que le Rhin dessert une population de 16,000,000 habitants, soit 27 pour cent de la population de l'empire. Il coule dans une région qui comprend 2,500,000 d'ouvriers, soit 28 pour cent du chiffre total de la population ouvrière allemande. Elle donne 50 pour cent de la production totale du charbon de l'Allemagne, 50 pour cent des produits chimiques, 50 pour cent de la bière, 83 pour cent du fer, 90 pour cent du vin.

Le Rhin est un fleuve magnifique sur lequel le frêt peut être très bas. De Carlsruhe, à l'embouchure du Rhin, sur une distance de 621 kil., il n'y a que 100 mètres de différence de niveau, 16 centimètres par kil. La largeur du fleuve n'est nulle part inférieure à 200 mètres : sa profondeur de la mer à Cologne est de 10 pieds ; de Cologne à Mannheim elle est de 7 à 8 pieds.

Mais ce beau fleuve a son embouchure en Hollande. Il aboutit à Rotterdam sous le nom de Maas. Là, dans le milieu de la rivière, des navires de haute mer, anarrés à des *Ducs d'Albe*, sont entourés de chalands qu'ils chargent à destination du Rhin avec des connaissements directs pour Ruhrort, Cologne, et Mannheim. Dans les

bouches de l'Escaut, entre Anvers et le Rhin, on trouve partout de grandes péniches qui viennent du Rhin ou vont le rejoindre. Le long du fleuve on voit des rames (trains) de bateaux, chacun de 500-600 tonnes, formant un total de 4,500 tonnes traînées par des remorqueurs. Le frêt entre Ruhrort et Rotterdam est à peine d'un centime par tonne.

Les 22,000,000m. votés en 1879 pour l'aménagement du Rhin, qui étaient dépensés en 1898, ont certainement servi aux populations que dessert ce fleuve¹; mais ils ont largement contribué au développement de Rotterdam et d'Anvers.

Voici le mouvement comparatif de la navigation rhénane d'Amsterdam, de Rotterdam et de la Belgique de 1900 à 1904 :

	Amsterdam	Rotterdam	Belgique
	En Tonnes	En Tonnes	En Tonnes
1900	446,800	7,845,500	2,605,800
1901	435,800	7,335,300	2,757,300
1902	451,900	8,197,900	3,238,800
1903	436,700	10,328,300	3,786,500
1904	428,800	10,684,200	4,104,300

Le Consul français d'Amsterdam dit dans son rapport de 1901 : 'L'influence allemande devient ici de plus en plus prépondérante dans le grand commerce.' Sur 510,000 habitants il y avait alors 5,000 Allemands. Relativement au chiffre la proportion est faible ; mais tous les êtres humains ne sont pas des unités de même ordre.

Un Belge, M. Ansiaux, professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles,¹ a fait une communication alarmante sur la pénétration des Allemands en Belgique. Il est tout étonné que le nombre et le tonnage des navires allemands qui entre dans le port d'Anvers augmente. Le contraire serait très grave pour Anvers : M. Ansiaux dit : 'Anvers est l'objectif principal de la pénétration des Allemands.' Cette phrase indiquerait qu'ils obéissent à un plan conquérant préconçu. Il n'en est rien. Ils viennent à Anvers, parce qu'Anvers est un des deux grands ports du Rhin. Ils s'y installent pour être au centre de leurs affaires. Ils y déploient de l'activité 'dans le haut commerce, dit-il, les banques, les transports maritimes, l'industrie naissante, les compagnies coloniales, l'enseignement, les cultes, les sociétés d'agrément, les consulats étrangers. Neuf banques anversoises importantes ont fait une place plus ou moins large dans leurs conseils à des sujets ou à des naturalisés d'origine allemande.' Les Allemands n'ont point procédé à cette invasion avec préméditation. Elle n'est pas une cause ; elle est la conséquence de la situation géographique d'Anvers. Comme Rotterdam, c'est un port allemand parce que son principal hinterland est l'Allemagne.

Mais que cette invasion ait pour résultat d'entraîner la Belgique

¹ Communication au Congrès de la Langue française à Liège, août 1905.

dans l'orbite de l'Allemagne, de l'imprégner de plus en plus profondément des idées, des mœurs et des intérêts allemands, c'est là une conséquence qu'il faut envisager avec tout le sérieux qu'elle comporte.

II.—TENTATIVES DE DÉTOURNEMENT

Dès 1883 M. Windhorst, le chef du centre catholique, réclamait le canal de Dortmund à Ems pour essayer de faire dériver une partie de la houille et de la production de cette partie du Rhin vers Emden. Guillaume II s'empara de ce projet : le canal fut inauguré le 11 août 1899. On avait compté pour la première année sur un trafic de 1,500,000 tonnes. Aujourd'hui il n'atteint pas 700,000 tonnes, malgré une réduction du taux des péages. Ce canal devait être 'la porte de sortie nationale' du pays du Rhin. On espérait surtout que les houilles de Westphalie refouleraient les houilles anglaises des ports allemands et des pays scandinaves. Le contraire se produisit. La première année pas une tonne de charbon allemand ne descendit le canal, mais 4,420 tonnes de charbon anglais le remontrèrent, et l'importation des charbons anglais à Hambourg augmentait.

Les charbons westphaliens continuèrent de prendre le Rhin pour aller à Rotterdam et à Anvers.

L'Empereur a complété le canal par le port d'Emden, situé juste en face de la rive hollandaise : c'est un port modèle qui a un mouillage de 11m.50, qui est pourvu de l'outillage le plus perfectionné. Il a coûté 20,000,000m. Mais 'le matériel de dragage y tient plus de place que les navires.' Cependant l'Empereur en a fait une escale obligatoire pour certains services qui n'ont rien à y faire. En dépit de ces efforts, on n'arrive pas à un tonnage de 500,000 tonnes.

Si on n'avait pas relié Dortmund au Rhin par un canal, c'était pour obliger les marchandises et la houille de ce district de se servir du canal. Cette précaution a été inutile. Aussi s'est-on décidé à comprendre dans les projets qui viennent d'être votés un canal de Dortmund au Rhin qui coûtera 2,500,000 mark. Mais les marchandises et la houille préféreront prendre ce transport rapide, peu onéreux et facile du Rhin, au lieu de prendre un canal de vingt-sept écluses pour aboutir à une ville qui n'est pas un centre commercial ; et l'expérience universelle prouve que les centres commerciaux ne s'improvisent pas.

L'effort que fera l'Empereur pour détourner les marchandises des ports de Rotterdam et d'Anvers vers Emden est donc condamné à un échec.

Certainement l'homme a cette supériorité sur tous les animaux qu'il peut changer son milieu ; mais il ne peut faire abstraction des conditions géographiques. Les Hollandais ont la conviction que Rotterdam est le plus grand port du Rhin, et que ni canaux, ni

tarifs de chemins de fer ne peuvent supprimer les avantages que donne ce fleuve. Je suppose que les Allemands et l'Empereur Guillaume ne se font pas d'illusions à cet égard. Alors s'ils veulent que le débouché des grandes provinces industrielles des bords du Rhin soit un port allemand, ils n'ont devant eux qu'une solution : c'est l'annexion de la Hollande, complétée tout au moins par celle d'Anvers à l'Allemagne.

III. -- LE PANGERMANISME

Je ne répéterai pas les citations très probantes données par M. Ellis Barker. Mais il est certain que pour tous les Pangermanistes, la Hollande et même la Belgique, doivent être absorbées par l'Allemagne. Sous le nom d'Europe centrale, ils englobent ces deux pays, ainsi que la Suisse, l'Autriche-Hongrie, la Serbie, la Roumanie et la Bulgarie.²

Bismarck, qui avait le souci des contingences et qui, après avoir fondé l'Empire allemand, considérait qu'il fallait le consolider et le conserver, n'était pas pangermaniste. Il s'opposa à l'annexion de la Bohême. Ce parti s'est développé après l'avènement de Guillaume II, avec le patronage de conseillers privés, de généraux, de magistrats, personnages officiels et de professeurs des universités qui, certainement, croyaient être les interprètes de la pensée de l'Empereur. Ceux-ci ont fondé le pangermanisme sur la langue et la race ; et comme leurs conceptions sont larges ils y ont englobé 2,000,000 d'Allemands en Suisse, 10,000,000 en Autriche-Hongrie, 1,000,000 en Russie et 8,000,000 de Bas-Allemands en Hollande et en Belgique.³

(1) Ils formulent un programme basé sur la dislocation de l'Autriche au lendemain de la mort de François Joseph. La Prusse recevrait la Silésie et la Moravie ; la Saxe prendrait la Bohême proprement dite ; la Bavière s'annexerait la région de l'Inn, Salzbourg, le Vorarlberg et le Tyrol ; la Haute-Autriche, la Basse-Autriche, la Carinthie et la Carniole formeraient un état autrichien d'environ 5,300,000 habitants ; le littoral 'Kustenland' avec la partie sud de la Dalmatie, Raguse, les bouches du Cattaro, Trieste et Pola formeraient un Reichsland, un pays d'empire, administré par un gouverneur militaire impérial ; le royaume d'Autriche serait lié à la Prusse par une convention militaire, mettant son armée dans une situation analogue à celle du Duché de Bade ou du Wurtemberg. La flotte autrichienne se fondrait dans la flotte allemande. Pola et Cattaro deviendraient des ports de guerre de l'empire. Ce plan est assez adroitement conçu. Il ne dépossède pas Berlin au détriment de Vienne. Il laisse cette dernière ville capitale d'un petit royaume.

² Voir *Central Europe*, by Joseph Pertsch.

³ Voir quoique avec réserves *l'Europe et la Question d'Autriche au Seuil du xxème Siècle*, par Chéradame ; *L'Allemagne et la France et la Question d'Autriche*, par le même. Actuellement, les allemands font de Rembrandt leur grand peintre.

Ce plan est complété par l'entrée de la Suisse, de la Hollande et de la Belgique dans l'union douanière, en attendant l'union politique. Quelque ridicules que puissent être les mégomanes qui ont conçu ces projets, ils ne font qu'exagérer des sentiments qui existent chez d'autres ; dédaigner les indices que donne leur psychologie, ce serait montrer une légèreté imprudente.

Les pangermanistes négligent plusieurs facteurs dans l'élaboration de leur plan. Ils oublient que l'Italie ne consentirait pas volontiers à voir Trieste devenir un port allemand. Ils supposent qu'à la mort de l'empereur François Joseph tous les Allemands d'Autriche vont se précipiter dans les bras de l'Empereur d'Allemagne ; et ils ne tiennent pas compte des autres nationalités qui font partie de l'empire. Dans la Cisleithanie il y a d'après le recensement de 1900 sur 26,000,000 d'habitants 9,170,000 d'Allemands, un peu plus du tiers. Et ces 9,170,000 d'Allemands sont-ils unanimes à demander l'annexion des provinces autrichiennes à l'Empire allemand ? D'après M. Chéradame, trois millions admettraient le fédéralisme de manière à donner satisfaction aux Slaves ; trois millions y sont opposés, mais sont aussi opposés à l'intervention prussienne ; trois millions sont des adversaires irréductibles des Slaves, et c'est parmi eux que se recrutent les pangermanistes. S'il n'y a pas unanimité parmi les Allemands, à plus forte raison y a-t-il de fortes oppositions parmi les hommes appartenant à d'autres nationalités. La Hongrie a été très allemande de sympathies et de relations : elle était reconnaissante à l'Allemagne du compromis de 1867 qu'elle obtint comme une conséquence de Sadowa. Ce fut un de ses hommes d'Etat, Andrassy, qui, ministre des Affaires étrangères de l'empire, lia l'Autriche-Hongrie à l'empire d'Allemagne. Mais en dépit des manifestations du parti de l'indépendance, ses hommes d'Etat savent fort bien que, sans le maintien de l'empire d'Autriche, la Hongrie ne serait plus qu'un petit état, livré à toutes sortes de dangers. Les Magyars n'ignorent pas qu'ils ne sont que 8,742,000 sur 19,254,000 habitants dans les Pays de la Couronne de Hongrie. Quand on voit et quand on entend les membres des diverses nationalités qui composent l'empire d'Autriche, on peut croire qu'ils sont entre eux des ennemis irréductibles. Mais s'ils font très mauvais ménage, personne ne veut le divorce. Le jour donc de la mort de l'empereur François Joseph ne sera point la fin de l'empire d'Autriche. Il continuera d'exister et toute l'Europe a intérêt à ce qu'il n'y soit pas porté atteinte. Guillaume II le sait bien et de plus, il a, pour ne pas partager les illusions des pangermanistes, d'excellentes raisons. Toute la politique des Hohenzollern a été de porter l'axe de l'Empire allemand à Berlin. L'annexion des provinces allemandes de l'Autriche le déplacerait. Il y a en Allemagne 35,200,000 protestants, dans la Cisleithanie, 500,000 à 600,000 ; il y a en Allemagne 20,300,000 catholiques et dans la Cisleithanie 20,600,000. Guillaume II est déjà obligé de

faire assez de concessions au centre catholique du Reichstag pour ne pas risquer de déplacer ainsi la majorité religieuse. Je ne crois donc pas que Guillaume II ait la moindre velléité de procéder au démembrement de l'empire d'Autriche à son profit à la mort de François Joseph : mais il est très possible qu'il profite de cet événement pour sembler faire un acte de générosité et de grand désintéressement. Il désavouera, avec l'emphase qui le caractérise, le pangermanisme, quoiqu'il se soit développé sous son œil paternel. Il déclarera, pour l'empire d'Autriche, que non seulement, il n'en veut pas le démembrement, mais qu'il en est le plus fidèle soutien ! Pour Trieste, il fera l'étonné. Songerait-il donc à prendre une ville que revendique l'Italie, une puissance de la triple alliance ? Quand il aura ébloui le monde de sa générosité, quand il aura dissipé les inquiétudes habilement préparées et amassées, quand il aura provoqué de toutes parts un mouvement de soulagement, il peut se retourner et dire aux autres nations : 'Maintenant que vous êtes rassurés, vous ne pouvez avoir d'objection à ce que la Hollande (et peut-être la Belgique) entrent dans le Zollverein allemand en attendant une annexion plus intime !'

Et il peut s'imaginer que l'opinion publique de l'Autriche, de la France, de l'Italie et peut-être d'autres pays éprouverait alors une telle satisfaction d'avoir échappé aux dangers qu'elle envisageait, qu'elle serait toute prête à dire : 'Ce n'est que cela ! faites !'

IV.—LA HOLLANDE ET LA BELGIQUE

Si cette hypothèse était invraisemblable, pourquoi donc ces revendications à l'égard de la Hollande, citées dans l'article de M. Ellis Barker ? L'empereur Guillaume II a un secret qu'il indique quand il répète à tout instant : 'Notre avenir est sur la mer !' et quand il parle de la politique coloniale allemande. L'avenir sur la mer ! et malgré tous ses efforts une grande partie du tonnage de l'Allemagne passe par la Hollande et Anvers ! Il veut avoir une flotte capable de lutter contre celle de l'Angleterre : et il ne peut la construire, l'équiper, la réparer que dans un arsenal naturellement bloqué, Kiel. Elle ne peut en sortir que par un canal qui, à la merci d'un accident, ne pourra supporter les navires d'un tonnage de plus en plus fort que prévoient les programmes de demain. Enfin l'Allemagne n'a trouvé de débouchés ni à sa population, ni à son industrie dans ses colonies africaines : elle n'en a trouvé que pour ses soldats et pour son budget ; par le traité anglo-japonais l'Angleterre a détruit toutes les velléités qu'avait pu provoquer l'occupation en Chine de Kiaotchéou.

Mais la Hollande a les Indes néerlandaises avec leur superficie de 2,000,000 de kil. carrés, leur population de 38,000,000 d'habitants, leur riche production de café, de sucre, d'épices, de tabac, d'étain,

Voilà un empire colonial digne de l'Empire allemand ! Guillaume II a tourné vers cet ensemble 'le regard de son désir,' comme dit la Bible.

D'abord il ne s'agit que du Zollverein ! En 1901 et 1902 en Allemagne MM. Stubmann, von Hale et Huton publièrent plusieurs brochures pour l'appuyer. En Hollande deux journaux, le *Haagsche Courant* et l'*Avondpost*, ont soutenu ce projet ainsi qu'une union postale. Ils disent aux Hollandais qu'en s'annexant à l'Allemagne ils auront pour débouché toute l'Europe centrale. Mais débouchés de quoi ? Les Hollandais ne sont pas de grands industriels ; déjà ils tirent à peu près tout le profit qu'ils peuvent tirer de leur situation géographique par rapport à l'Allemagne ; et Guillaume II ne la leur enlèvera pas.

D'après mes renseignements, les Hollandais prévoyants comprennent bien le désir de l'Empereur ; mais, quant à sa réalisation, ils ne sont pas du tout disposés à l'aider. Les catholiques, qui sont au nombre des deux cinquièmes en Hollande, ne tiennent pas à augmenter la puissance d'un état protestant ; et les institutions militaires du type allemand n'ont rien qui les tente. Quant aux trois millions de protestants, ils justifient le vieux dicton : 'Il n'y a de bonnes haines qu'entre membres d'une même famille.' Les Hollandais ont gardé de leurs vieilles luttes irrespectueuses contre les Espagnols une indépendance de caractère et d'esprit qui les empêche d'être séduits par les airs inspirés de Guillaume II. Le rapprochement spontané de la Hollande vers l'Allemagne est hors de question. Il ne pourrait y avoir qu'un rapprochement forcé. Par des tarifs de chemin de fer et le canal de Dortmund à Ems ? Impossible. Les industriels et les ouvriers de la Westphalie et de la province du Rhin se considèrent déjà comme sacrifiés aux hobereaux endettés de l'Est. Ils seront les premiers à s'opposer à la fermeture du débouché naturel au profit d'un débouché onéreux. Jamais Emden n'aura que le déchet de Rotterdam et d'Anvers ; et Rotterdam en éprouverait-il une perte qu'elle serait considérée comme de peu d'importance relativement à la perte de la nationalité hollandaise dont, quelque ménagée qu'elle fût pour les choses secondaires, les intérêts vitaux se décideraient à Berlin.

Je dois ajouter que certains Hollandais, parmi ceux qui ont de l'action sur l'opinion publique, disent : 'La Hollande doit s'entendre avec la Belgique, marcher de pair, ce qui peut être effectué, sans aucun inconvénient pour aucune des deux.'

Tandis que des Hollandais le disaient, plutôt dans des conversations particulières qu'ils ne le manifestaient publiquement, en 1905, juste au moment où on fêtait bruyamment le soixante-quinzième anniversaire de la révolution qui a séparé la Belgique de la Hollande, un écrivain belge, M. Eugène Baie, publia dans le *Petit Bleu* une série d'articles sur une alliance franco-hollandaise. Leur succès

prouvé qu'ils répondaient à une préoccupation des deux pays qui sont inquiets des visées de leur formidable voisin.

Au point de vue du droit international, la question se pose : Une nation neutre peut-elle faire un traité avec une autre nation ? Arendt, Ernest Nys, Descamps, Westlake, répondent affirmativement. Il ne saurait être question de revenir sur les faits accomplis en 1830, mais évidemment la Belgique et la Hollande peuvent se lier plus intimement et s'assurer leur concours réciproque dans telle ou telle éventualité.

L'éventualité, c'est une guerre, et toute nation qui a souci de sa conservation doit la prévoir : car elle ne dépend pas d'elle ; elle dépend d'un ou plusieurs autres états. Il n'y a pour elle qu'un seul moyen de réfréner ces velléités belliqueuses : c'est d'être forte et d'avoir une politique dont la fermeté ne puisse pas être mise en doute.

La Haye est le siège des conférences de la paix, du tribunal arbitral ; Carnegie lui a offert des fonds pour la construction d'un palais de la paix.

Napoléon III avait proposé en 1863 la réunion d'un congrès dont l'objet serait de réduire les armements exagérés entretenus par de mutuelles méfiances ; et le 24 janvier 1870 il faisait prier la reine Victoria de présenter au Roi de Prusse, Guillaume I, un projet de désarmement pour la France et l'Allemagne. Six mois après la guerre éclatait. L'Empereur de Russie a eu l'initiative des conférences de la Haye, mais il n'a pas songé à soumettre au tribunal arbitral les réclamations du Japon relatives à son refus d'évacuer la Mandchourie, et une fois de plus c'est la guerre qui a donné la solution.

Le monde officiel belge par une singulière aberration a été pendant longtemps complètement germanisé. Cette aberration ne s'expliquait pas suffisamment par le souvenir des propositions d'annexion que Bismarck s'était fait faire par Napoléon III.

Les Belges et les Hollandais ont déjà consenti à une forme d'union qui prend le titre suivant dans *l'Almanach Gotha* (p. 516) : ' *Union d'administrations de chemins de fer allemands* : font partie de cette union les lignes de chemins de fer de l'Allemagne, des Pays-Bas, ainsi que d'un chemin de fer de la Belgique.' Je crois que cette passion germanophile s'est calmée, mais dans ces dernières années nous avons été témoins de singulières aberrations de la part des Hollandais et des Belges.

Les Hollandais croyaient qu'il était de leur devoir de s'identifier avec les Boers. C'était pour eux une question de famille et pour certains d'entre eux une question d'intérêt. Je dois dire cependant que j'ai vu, à ce moment, un certain nombre d'hommes avisés qui se lamentaient sur les imprudences de l'opinion publique de leurs concitoyens. Ils allaient même jusqu'à reprocher à leur Gouvernement d'avoir envoyé un navire de guerre chercher Kruger. Mais ils

n'étaient qu'une minorité, et j'admets que les Hollandais eussent un coefficient personnel d'erreur excusable.

Mais en était-il de même des Belges? Ils oubliaient que l'Angleterre en 1831, avec la France, avait assuré leur existence; ils oubliaient que l'Angleterre est toujours en Europe la garante de l'indépendance des petits peuples. Au moment de la guerre des Boers, en 1900 à Paris, dans les congrès des Amis de la paix, à la Conférence Interparlementaire, les Belges se montrèrent les plus ardents anglophobes. Il fallait voir l'ardeur des représentants de cette nation neutre à pousser les Gouvernements des autres nations à intervenir en faveur des Boers contre l'Angleterre. Ils invoquaient l'article 27 du traité final de la conférence de la Haye pour engager les Gouvernements à inviter l'Angleterre de mettre fin à la guerre sud africaine.

Ils traitaient en ennemi—j'en sais quelque chose—quiconque leur faisait observer que ce n'était pas faire acte sérieux que d'inviter un Gouvernement à faire une démarche qu'il savait d'avance inutile.

Inviter quelqu'un à aller recevoir un camouflet, c'est une singulière manière de procéder. De deux choses l'une, ou le Gouvernement, rabroué, se résignerait en disant: 'J'étais prévenu. Tant pis pour moi de m'être exposé à ce désagrément!' Et il garderait son humiliation avec plus ou moins de rancune. Ou bien, il se fâcherait d'autant plus qu'il se serait mis dans son tort. Alors c'était la guerre, une conflagration générale.

Toutes les chancelleries se montrèrent plus pacifiques que les pacifistes, et ce risque fut évité.

Mais comment les Belges, comment les Hollandais, ne comprenaient-ils pas que l'Angleterre est leur sauvegarde? Par quelle aberration le général Brialmont croyait-il que ce rôle appartenait à la Russie et comment pouvait-il imaginer qu'elle fût 'le grand pouvoir de l'Europe'?

Enfin les Belges ne doivent pas oublier que les puissances signataires du traité de 1839, lui donnent la garantie de la neutralité, mais ne lui donnent point la garantie de l'intégrité et de l'inviolabilité du territoire.⁴ Et du reste, parmi les puissances signataires se trouve la Prusse; et c'est de l'Allemagne que la Belgique a tout à redouter.

V.—LE NŒUD DE L'ENTENTE CORDIALE ENTRE L'ANGLETERRE ET LA FRANCE.

On a pu reprocher à M. Gladstone certaines faiblesses dans la politique étrangère, mais jamais il n'a transigé au point de vue de l'indépendance de la Belgique. Au mois d'août 1870 il faisait des

⁴ Ernest Nys, *Le Droit international*, tome I. p. 391.

traités séparés avec la Prusse et avec la France, obligeant l'Angleterre, dans le cas où une des nations ne respecterait pas la neutralité de la Belgique, à prendre le parti de l'autre. En 1875, au moment de l'intervention si efficace de la reine Victoria pour empêcher une agression de l'Allemagne contre la France, Gladstone envoya une commission en Belgique pour concerter les mesures de défense.

Aujourd'hui l'entente cordiale de l'Angleterre et de la France est fondée exactement sur les mêmes raisons que celles qui ont déterminé l'Angleterre à combattre Napoléon. C'est un danger pour elle comme pour le monde entier qu'il y ait en Europe un état dont l'ambition n'a pas de limites et dont le souverain puisse à son gré disposer de la paix ou de la guerre dans le monde.

On a compris maintenant en France et, je crois, tout le monde a compris en Angleterre que la seule manière de maintenir la paix en Europe était l'accord des deux nations. Elles représentent une formidable puissance stratégique ; car si en Allemagne on pense à des débarquements en Angleterre, on peut prévoir aussi des débarquements en Allemagne d'armées alliées, ayant pour base d'opération, des moyens de transport qui ont montré leur efficacité dans la guerre de l'Afrique du sud. La sauvegarde de l'indépendance de la Hollande et de la Belgique est la raison d'être de l'entente cordiale entre la France et l'Angleterre. Les manifestations qui l'affirment, les échanges de bons procédés qui apprennent aux deux nations à mieux se connaître, sont excellents ; mais c'est la nécessité de maintenir indemne la situation de ces deux nations, qui soude les intérêts de la France et de l'Angleterre, et, je puis ajouter, les intérêts de toutes les autres nations civilisées, sauf une.

YVES GUYOT.

MR. HALDANE'S PROPOSALS

THE result of the elections in January last, which gave an overwhelming majority to a Prime Minister who, outside England, is regarded as a typical 'Little Englander,' could not fail to excite the liveliest apprehensions amongst all to whom party squabbles are of little account except in so far as they affect the fortunes of the British Empire. No one who read the foreign newspapers at the time could miss the note of exhilaration which greeted the probable return of British policy to old grooves. Great Britain till within the last few years had become traditional for a hand-to-mouth system of National Defence which must have brought us to grief but for the steady and persistent effort of individuals. History indeed shows us that in the past the British Empire has been built up, not by the policy of Governments, but by the devotion and often by the sacrifice of enthusiasts.

How has our Empire grown in the last twenty years, and what provision have we made for supporting it? We can neither ignore nor minimise our liabilities. We have become responsible for Egypt and have reclaimed the vast but neglected provinces of that country in the Soudan and have made them a 'going concern.' We have greatly developed our territories in East Africa and have built a railway in Uganda. We have undertaken the charge of two great Colonies in South Africa, which will give our statesmen work for a generation, and must influence our views of Imperial defence for all time. With such responsibilities we may well pause to consider whether our defensive establishments should stand even at the point at which they stood before the late war proved their insufficiency. But apart from these acquisitions, the risks of our Empire and our commerce abroad have enormously developed during the same period. In Asia the frontiers, which before brought us in contact with semi-barbarous peoples, have now been approached by foreign rivals. In China every class of international question—commercial, financial and military—has constantly arisen; and, even though we have here fortified ourselves by our alliance with the Japanese, our commitments, if trouble should arise, cannot fail to be great, seeing the number of first-class Powers who might be concerned with them.

It requires neither a mathematician nor a profound thinker to

estimate the additional claim for national insurance which we have incurred by undertaking these liabilities. Nothing is easier than to make speeches in the House of Commons full of hasty generalisations as to the total cost which we incur in maintaining a world-wide Empire as compared with Germany, nearly all of whose possessions are in a ring fence. It is equally easy to say that a sound foreign policy will preserve us from international complications, or to declare, like Mr. Punch, that 'John Bull is either an island or a continent. In the former case he requires a large fleet and a small army, and in the latter the reverse.' Indeed, if we push the views of the Blue Water School to their legitimate issue, we require no army at all for Home Defence.

These contentions might be more convincing if they were not continually stultified by current events. The Navy, as Lord Salisbury pointed out, cannot fight in Macedonia, and naval manœuvres do not always support the fiat of the Admiralty that nothing but a small raid on these islands is possible. The fact remains that, if we come to a difficulty with Russia, we must provide on the North-West frontier of India a body of regular troops as numerous as those we sent to the Boer War, and must further provide this force as well as our British force in India with reinforcements at the rate of nearly 100 per cent. per annum, if we are to maintain them in the tropics. Military estimates are proverbially unreliable. It is to be hoped our naval forecasts will not prove equally delusive. Those who glibly limit our future liabilities forget that we were forced to send 400,000 men in two and a half years to South Africa to complete a campaign for which our military authorities originally demanded 40,000; and that, had the trouble threatened by Turkey on the Egyptian frontier developed in the present summer, we should have had to confront a large force of brave troops with a fanatical Mussulman population at our backs. To say, then, that a large fleet, or even a sound policy, will preserve us from the necessity of a strong striking force can only serve to garnish a Parliamentary peroration.

It is highly desirable that in a discussion of our needs we should free ourselves from party recrimination. The work of Army reform is difficult enough; it is at present obscured by rival schemes and the obloquy heaped on those who introduced them. Whether the Cardwell system be right or not is a comparatively minor matter. If it has failed, it has only been because sufficient men are very difficult to secure under a voluntary system, and sufficient money during a time of peace, which is our normal condition, has not been forthcoming to carry it through. The pivot of public opinion is constantly shifting. During the life of the late Government alone, one Secretary of State was as heartily upbraided for his extravagance as his predecessor had been for his parsimony. The question is not one of schemes; it is rather whether we should keep up a

highly trained army, or content ourselves with a nucleus round which we can group half-trained units.

So far as I can judge from an intimate acquaintance with the interior of the War Office, all Governments up to 1895 were content to conduct what was called army policy on a somewhat haphazard system. The Army had not grown up on any definite rule, the Auxiliary Forces still less so. Different standards had at different times been adopted as to the force we should equip either for foreign service or for home defence, but none of these standards had been adhered to. It was only in 1885 that, under General Brackenbury, a really efficient Intelligence Department began to be organised ; but, although the ' thinking ' side of our Army had been neglected, Lord Wolseley, assisted by Sir Redvers Buller and Sir Evelyn Wood, had, during the ten years previous to 1895, made a most manful effort to organise the troops at their disposal for war. Some progress was made, but neither the Ministry nor the country were in the mood to realise that they were spending 16,000,000*l.* or 17,000,000*l.* on a force which was dear at the price since it could not mobilise or be maintained in the field without considerable further expenditure. To send 35,000 men to Egypt in 1884-5 we had to break up half the Army.

For forty years after the Crimean War we muddled along as best we could. The Adjutant-General might convince the Minister, the Minister might convince the Cabinet, that there were defects, but the money did not come. Indeed, the demands of India, which clearly showed that in case of war on the Afghan frontier a large body of troops would be required from England, were never grappled with. It is probable that successive Governments believed that, with the difficulty of transporting troops many thousands of miles, ample time would remain for the necessary preparations after war had broken out, and that, by maintaining the Indian force at a high level of equipment on the spot, sufficient preparation was being made for the immediate emergency. However this may have been, I can aver from personal experience that nothing could have been more discouraging and unsatisfactory than the administration of the Army up to 1895 to those who recognised that in certain contingencies our land forces must bear the main brunt of a great war.

All this was changed when Lord Lansdowne came to the War Office. In July 1895 a Defence Committee of the Cabinet was established, with the Duke of Devonshire as chairman. Limited as was the purview of this Committee, it was invaluable in deciding questions relating to our military strength. Seven years later, at the urgent instance of the heads of the Admiralty and the War Office, the present Defence Committee was established by Mr. Balfour when he became Prime Minister, for the purpose of reviewing and providing for the whole of our liabilities in all parts of the globe. But, admirable and all-important as has been the work of this Committee, the credit

due to the Duke of Devonshire's original Defence Committee must not be obscured by the brilliant services of its successor. In 1895 for the first time, the relative responsibility of the Army and Navy for national defence was clearly defined. The demands of both services were considered together, and in the case of the Army, as of the Navy, the programme put forward each year by the military chiefs was minutely scrutinised by the Secretary of State and First Lord of the Admiralty in consultation with some of their most influential colleagues, who called before them and discussed the details with the heads of the two services.

The results of this system were immediately felt, and were far-reaching. The difference between the pre-1895 and post-1895 systems was immeasurable. Probably not a year passed from 1875 to 1895 in which such subjects as the following were not discussed on War Office estimates in the Secretary of State's room :

(1) The insufficient number of Line battalions to relieve the Line battalions maintained to guard our possessions abroad ;

(2) The inability of a battalion of 700 at home to keep up a battalion of 1,000 in the tropics, by recruiting boys, half of whom were under eighteen ;

(3) The necessity for increased artillery ;

(4) The weakness of our Intelligence Department compared with that of foreign armies ;

(5) The fact that our barracks had universally fallen below modern requirements.

No one who heard these discussions could doubt that the Secretary of State would have so cogent a case for further expenditure that he must prevail with his colleagues ; but in many cases the all-sufficient answer was : ' These demands involve increases to the extent of 2,000,000*l.* per annum. We can afford 200,000*l.*, but we cannot put on fresh taxation to meet such demands in time of peace. If these things are necessary, economies must be practised under other heads.' It is true that a strong Minister might have urged that Committee after Committee had sat on War Office affairs, and instead of producing economy, had recommended expenditure. He might have cited in particular the case of Lord Randolph Churchill's famous Committee of 1887, which recommended economies in all amounting to about 100,000*l.* per annum, but accepted an estimate for the improvement of barracks amounting to 4,000,000*l.* in a single morning. No doubt on many occasions a Minister might have produced a crisis, but, as a Member of the Cabinet of 1886, now deceased, once observed to me : ' You may be correct in your view, that you have not got what is necessary to send and maintain 70,000 men abroad ; but there are not ten men in the House of Commons who would vote for a policy which would involve the despatch of such a force.'

So matters progressed, or rather retrogressed, and despite

the presence of a strong band of army reformers on the military side of the War Office, matters continued to retrogress, until by the familiar practice of saving on stores in time of peace, it was discovered in 1895 that our Army had become one to which peace was a necessity.

The Army Estimates for the four years which followed before the war broke out, proved how completely this policy was reversed by Lord Lansdowne and the then Defence Committee. The Army was in every respect brought up to the standard necessary to send and maintain two Army Corps, or 70,000 men, abroad. The never-ceasing and wearisome problem of drafts was resolutely faced. The inequalities between battalions at home and abroad were met by the addition of seven battalions to the line and two to the Guards, while every battalion on the home establishment was fortified with eighty additional men, so that the 'squeezed lemons' might be available for mobilisation after their drafts had gone; sixteen additional batteries of Artillery were authorised; a large loan was taken for the improvement of barracks; 40,000 acres were bought for manœuvring purposes on Salisbury Plain; manœuvres on a large scale were re-established for the training of officers and men; stores were brought up to the requisite strength, and were established in storehouses at convenient centres instead of being massed at Woolwich, from which it would have required six weeks to extract them. It is to the timely provision made by Lord Lansdowne and his coadjutors that we owe the fact that with all its defects the War Office managed to maintain a force of over 200,000 men in the field at 6,000 miles from its base for over two years, and this without practically a single complaint from the General in command of the quality of the supplies furnished. In a word, Lord Lansdowne, instead of giving the heads of the Army a few crumbs when they required a full meal, established a system by which, whatever expenditure the Army could justify to the Ministry, was carried through, or the Secretary of State would have resigned.

After proceeding for ten years on this system, the public and the Army welcomed Mr. Haldane as a Minister who, although representing a Liberal Government, might be expected to show sufficient independence of character to adopt a similar national procedure. His ability was known; his personality was acceptable. On various committees he had shown an open mind on military questions. His early speeches tended to confirm the generous estimate formed of him. He hastened in December to remove the bad impression caused by the ill-considered and inaccurate protest of the Prime Minister at the Albert Hall against 'keeping our defensive services on a war footing in time of peace.' He assured the country before the General Election that he had the authority of the Prime Minister for stating that, if more money was required than at present for the Army, it would be granted. His statements in the earlier part of the Session were equally satisfactory. 'He wanted time for thought; he would

not act in haste. We must measure our forces by our responsibilities, and not merely by our purse. He would be guided by expert opinion, and not by popular clamour.'

These undertakings were fortified by categorical statements, in reply to questions in the House of Commons. Rumours had got about that ten or twelve battalions were to be dispensed with, and that a considerable number of batteries of artillery were to be disbanded. Mr. Haldane, between the time he introduced the Army Estimates in March and his speech in July, gave distinct assurances that these rumours were incorrect, and that no changes would be adopted without the fullest discussion. It is open, indeed, to doubt whether constitutionally the War Minister has a right to dispense with the troops voted by Parliament without further sanction from Parliament. The House of Commons, after grave debate, voted early in March 1906 both money and men on the same basis as in 1905. Nevertheless, on the 12th of July the Secretary for War announced that he proposed to reduce some 20,000 men, involving with the reserve 40,000 men. After a discussion of six hours, of which time Mr. Haldane consumed over half in explaining the measures proposed, the debate closed, and the plea of the Opposition, that the pledge for deliberation should be strictly observed, was met by the Prime Minister with the cynical suggestion that, as an intellectual exercise, they could take a few hours on the Appropriation Bill. Indeed, not the least discreditable element of the whole proceeding was the disregard of the rights of Parliament involved in Mr. Haldane's hasty surrender to the section of the Liberal party against which he had undertaken to defend the interests of the Army.

It would be well that those who have an open mind as regards Mr. Haldane's proposals should read carefully the memorandum of the 30th of July issued just after Parliament had risen. A practised Parliamentarian would probably never have submitted such a memorandum to the test of Parliamentary debate. Mr. Haldane writes and speaks as if the Army Council, over which he presides, had been the first body to attempt to carry out the duties of organisation for war. Apparently we have now for the first time entered on the phase of reality. Shams are to be discarded, practical measures to be taken, 'a careful survey has been made of the Army as a whole, both of the regular and auxiliary forces.' Has this never been done before? Mr. Haldane has only been eight months at the War Office. Can he have studied the minutes of Lord Wolseley and the brilliant body of officers who surrounded him, and the decisions given upon them, in the light of the pregnant fact that the mobilisation of the regular force sent to South Africa proceeded absolutely smoothly and without hitch? Or, coming to a more recent date, can he be unaware that the whole of these questions were considered by Lord Roberts, assisted by some of the ablest of those who had served

in South Africa, including General Nicholson, who now sits on his own Council? Is it wise to ignore these successive efforts to organise the Army? Is it generous to include the drastic measures taken after the war to secure efficient training for the troops in the category of shams and unrealities? Is it not somewhat ominous that Mr. Haldane, while ignoring the results these officers have achieved, and the reasons for the increases which they demanded, should confidently put forward as a scheme of his own some of the very proposals which his predecessors attempted, and were unable to carry through on a voluntary system?

Let me give a few instances. I pass over the fact that, whether from policy or conviction, Mr. Haldane treats the organisation of the Army as a matter first for peace, and secondly only for war. He lays down that 'it is the principle of the Government plan to ascertain what number of regular troops it is necessary to retain at home in peace for the purpose of finding drafts for the forces of the Crown overseas, and then to organise out of them as complete an expeditionary force as possible.' The view of the late Government was, first, to ascertain the necessary strength of the Army for war, and then so to organise it as to adapt it for the provision of drafts and for peace requirements. In this latter respect, although he makes it his first object, Mr. Haldane ignores all experience. In 1897 we had 78,000 infantry abroad and 56,000 at home. The home infantry were not found sufficient to provide drafts for the foreign infantry. In 1906 we have 82,000 infantry abroad and 59,000 at home. The proportion is less. Mr. Haldane proposes to make the disproportion greater still by abolishing ten battalions. In 1897 it was proved that nothing less than an establishment of 800 rank and file would enable the drafts to be provided for the battalions abroad. Mr. Haldane reduces that estimate by about 10 per cent., and thinks the drafts will still be obtained. The contention of all military chiefs down to the present day, in common I believe with those of all foreign armies, is that it is not desirable to introduce much more than 50 per cent. of reservists into the ranks on mobilisation. Mr. Haldane proposes to utilise 70,000 reservists with 50,000 regular troops. The experience of the late war, confirming the opinion of all the advisers of successive Secretaries of State, has made it clear that you cannot afford to use up your Reserve on first mobilisation. You must leave a considerable margin for subsequent drafts. The Reserve is now 120,000; Mr. Haldane's measures will bring it down to close to 70,000, and every man will have to go abroad the moment war breaks out. We leave nothing behind us. One of the weakest points in our Army is the reserve of officers on mobilisation. Mr. Haldane recognises this, and talks vaguely of a scheme to amend it. Meantime the reductions proposed will leave the Army short by 600 officers who now exist. Do not these instances, overriding not only the advice of Lord Wolseley

and Lord Roberts, but the actual experience of a campaign, give us serious reason for reflection ?

Take again the training of the Militia. All sorts of efforts have been made at different times to institute a longer training for the Militia. It is true that while the Militia was compulsorily mobilised during the war, and men could be trained for a longer period, progress was made with certain batteries of Militia Artillery. But if the Militia are to be used in the first line, I venture to think that no officer who understands field service will disagree with me in saying—first, they must be trained longer than one month per annum; second, the men to be sent out must be at least as old as the men of the Line; third, if responsible positions with ammunition columns are to be assigned to them they must be well disciplined, even if they know comparatively little of drill.

How are these results to be achieved? Mr. Haldane ignores all that was done for the Militia after the war. Their disabilities were considered and every effort was made to meet them. In 1899, the old 'Militia Reserve' was in force. This reserve took for the Line 100 or 200 men out of the Militia battalion which was shortly to be embodied as a service battalion, 'milking it dry' of its best men. In 1901 the so-called 'Militia Reserve' was abolished, and the Militia became self-supporting. Every trained Militiaman was given 3*l.* a year in the winter as a supplement to his pay, which, as his annual service was twenty-seven days, represented an addition of over 2*s.* a day, and tended largely to prevent desertion. Militia officers were also encouraged to attend schools of instruction, and a sum of 10,000*l.* annually was voted to carry this out at the public expense. A reserve for the Militia itself was instituted. All these things are now passed over, and we are told that by sympathy and consideration the Militia will become again a 'self-respecting' force. By what process or by what payment is Mr. Haldane going to get men of nineteen to join the Militia instead of boys of seventeen? What Artilleryman will he cite in favour of his proposal to utilise over 10,000 men with the Artillery who, apart from their recruit drills, will only have received one month's training in two or three consecutive years?

We are told that schemes have been drawn out for all this. But the problem of inducing employers to dispense with their men's services for military employment is no new one. Militiamen are sufficiently wideawake not to undertake to give, as was the case in the Boer war, two years' service in the field for a retaining fee of 1*l.* a year. If Mr. Haldane is to get the men, he will have to pay, and if he has to pay what is necessary, the meagre economies which he expects from substituting Militia for Regulars and Reservists will disappear.

In no case is this mistaken economy so manifest as in the proposals

relative to the Artillery. Mr. Stanhope nearly twenty years ago reduced certain batteries of Artillery on the assurance by his military advisers that they were surplus to the requirements of the Army on mobilisation and to the needs of two Army Corps in the field. Since that time every foreign nation has increased the proportion of Artillery to its Infantry. It is notorious that Artillery cannot be improvised, and that, even if guns are kept in store, men require special training to serve them. Great Britain, which has an immense mass of Infantry of various descriptions and a long purse, is surely the one nation which ought to have an excess of Artillery over Infantry. This was realised by Lord Lansdowne's advisers, and, beginning before the war, sixty-seven batteries in all were added. There has been no difficulty about recruiting, nor is there any real difficulty as regards Reserve. If one battalion at home can supply one battalion abroad with drafts, one battery of Artillery at home can supply one battery abroad with drafts. On this assumption there remain between thirty and forty batteries in Great Britain which will not have to supply drafts. To these batteries, therefore, the three years' system is applicable, which, with the nine years in the Reserve, will rapidly bring up the Artillery Reserve.

Mr. Haldane has repeated in his memorandum of the 30th of July his statement that to mobilise forty-two field batteries with their ammunition columns we shall be 'obliged to destroy the remaining fifty-one batteries in the United Kingdom.' This, as his advisers very well know, may be true at this moment, but it will not be true in three years' time, when 10,000 more men will have gone to the Reserve. The service with the colours of the men in the sixty-seven batteries raised by Lord Lansdowne being now nearly complete, they have only just begun to provide Reservists. Mr. Haldane, therefore, for the purpose of discrediting the existing system, insists on a temporary disability as if it were permanent. This contention is indeed extraordinary from the mouth of a Minister who in the next breath asks us to accept as available for our striking force 30,000 'persons trained in Militia business,' not one of whom has yet signified his willingness to serve abroad. One thing is clear: we are to lose somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 trained Artillerists, or counting Reserve 6,000 to 8,000, at a time when the richest nation in Europe might at least be expected to keep that minimum proportion of trained Artillery to its small Army which other nations strain themselves to preserve for their immense hosts.

If this blending of the Militia with the Line is to be undertaken at all, and in certain circumstances it is most desirable, it should be as a supplement to and not as a substitute for Regulars. The new scheme mars efficiency and does not create economy. I will test this by an average case. A battery requires say 170 men on mobilisation. Of those say 110 are maintained with the colours, while each battery would have 130 in reserve, leaving a margin of 70 for drafts, young

soldiers, &c. The men with the colours cost say 70*l.* apiece; the men with the reserve 9*l.* The average cost of each soldier serving in the field is therefore 37*l.* The batteries which Mr. Haldane proposes to raise to war strength by means of the Militia will, it is estimated, have to maintain one-third of their number in permanent employment. These will be all highly paid men averaging over 70*l.* apiece. The remainder will be Militia who, apart from any special inducements which Mr. Haldane may find it necessary to offer Militiamen to undertake immediate service in the field, will cost half as much again as Reservists. The three batteries of Militia which formed the subject of an interesting experiment in 1902-3 had only a permanent staff of 123, but they proved an expensive luxury. Without knowing the precise terms now proposed and the numbers relatively of Regulars and Militia to the new batteries, we cannot tell if there will be any saving at all; indeed it is not clear that in the end there will not be an increase. The only point which is certain is that we shall exchange fully trained batteries of Artillery for a less highly organised force.

If these facts as to cost had been appreciated, I believe the hasty disbandment of the Guards would have been avoided. For war purposes the Guards regiments are cheaper than any Line regiment. Their three years' system enables them to put a far larger proportion of Reservists into the field with their battalions than the Line. As a result of this the cost is less. If in the Line there is one Reservist for every two men serving, and in the Guards one Reservist for every one man serving, the average cost of the Linesmen in the fighting line will be about 42*l.*, while the average cost of every Guardsman will be about 35*l.* Apart, therefore, from all consideration of *esprit de corps*, of superiority of troops and of foreign ridicule, as a matter of economics no more fatuous proposal was ever carried through. But while the above is based on the cost of organising our army for war, Mr. Haldane, as his paper of the 30th of July shows, is considering primarily the organisation for peace. These figures therefore may not have entered into his calculation.

Reviewing these discussions, not from the standpoint of present or past schemes, or of what one Minister or another has said, or even of what one Army Council or another has recommended or is willing to justify, let us face the plain facts of the situation. As regards the Regular Army, we are now reducing Line battalions which in 1898 were considered necessary in order to maintain our garrisons abroad, which garrisons recent events make it clear we have taken at too low an estimate. We are also reducing the strength of home battalions which ten years ago it was found could not supply the necessary foreign drafts. We are bringing down our Artillery before we have found a substitute for it, and at a time when in proportion to our other troops it can least be spared. Surely it follows on all this that, so long as we are trading on a very narrow margin, the projects for uniting the Militia with the Line and utilising it for foreign service, or

for making further use of the Yeomanry and Volunteers oversea, should be supplemental to our existing Regular organisation, and not a substitute for it.

The Yeomanry undoubtedly owe the success of the reorganisation of 1901 to the extent to which they have been taken up by their respective counties. If Mr. Haldane, by encouraging local associations or by other means, can succeed in filling the depleted ranks of the Militia, or in providing the Militia and Volunteers with the requisite number of officers, even if he be compelled to induce the Volunteer force to regulate its strength by the number of officers available to make it efficient, he will have done something to perfect the organisation so much of which he has found ready to his hand. His first step, however, is a faulty one. The Volunteer battalions who to fit them for service in the Field Army received a fortnight's training in camp, at Lord Roberts's urgent request, are to be reduced to one week. On the other hand, in an ominous paragraph of his memorandum Mr. Haldane proposes to charge these county associations, which are already invited to render efficient forces which number 350,000 men, with the duty of fostering rifle clubs, cadet corps, and other semi-military bodies, who, while they are not a substitute for the Regulars which it is proposed to reduce, can hardly fail to draw away from the 'more highly organised sections of the National Army' those men who are most wanted. It is difficult to understand how anyone responsible for the Army, though he may desire to see every youth taught the rudiments of military service, should wish to multiply the already too numerous organisations of which we are only tolerant because they have grown up haphazard and we have become accustomed to them. If the proposal of the late Government, which was hotly contested by a small band in the House of Commons, could now be adopted, by which each Yeomanry regiment or each Militia regiment might be invited to accept special terms for a squadron or company to be sent abroad, after the Army Reserve is exhausted, under the command of its own officers, an important addition would be made to our military forces.

I venture to press the above considerations on Mr. Haldane and the Army Council. The lessons of the most recent wars make it clear that we can leave nothing to chance. 'We want professionals, not amateurs: we can rely only on assured Reserves, not on chance levies; we must pay men in time of peace for what we want them to do in time of war. Having added 2,600,000 square miles to our Empire, apart from our new South African Colonies, we should remember the warning addressed to Cæsus: 'If any man come who has better iron than you, he will be master of all this gold.' It is on this ground that we should not lightly, in deference to the so-called mandate of a General Election, adopt a policy which has already greatly shaken the sense of security throughout the Empire.

ST. JOHN BRODRICK.

WASTED RECRUITS

IN this Review of July, 1883, General Sir Lintorn Simmons wrote concerning the waste of the British Army, which he aptly likened to the pouring of water on a sieve. He stated that men joined, and within twelve months were gone again. It was direct desertion in some instances, but in the majority of cases recruits, after nine months' training, were pronounced unfit by the same medical officers who previously had 'passed' them into the regular ranks. Sir L. Simmons pointed out that the general result for the whole Army was that out of 186,469 men who had enlisted during the previous eight years, 47,648, or one-fourth, had disappeared before the end of the year succeeding that in which they enlisted; and 54,993 before the end of the second year, with an average of little more than ten months' service. These men had cost the country the enormous sum of 3,150,000*l.*, without yielding any return, the whole sum having been entirely wasted. After making due allowance for death and disease, and for dismissal for misconduct, General Simmons estimated that 45,000 fewer recruits would have been required during these eight years to keep the Army up to its strength. And if waste at subsequent periods of service were included, it could be conclusively proved that from 7,000 to 8,000 fewer recruits would be required annually if the men remained in the Service during the periods for which they engaged to serve. As the actual number of recruits enlisted below nineteen years of age during the period of nine years was only 58,898, General Simmons contended that it was evident that if this costly and useless waste could have been prevented it would not have been necessary to have enlisted any of these youths, and the Army still would have been complete to its establishment. Again, Sir Lintorn Simmons said: 'The young soldiers by thousands yearly purchase their discharges, or desert, while many break down under training and return to their homes without pensions, to drag out a miserable existence, and earn their living as best they can as invalids.' General Simmons later expressed the opinion that, if nothing were done to stop this outflow of men from the Army, we should quickly come within measurable distance of conscription. These remarks were written twenty-three years ago, when it was

considered advisable, by those who understood how serious was the condition of things then existing, that steps should be taken to ascertain the cause of this extraordinary waste of the Army. A few medical authorities took up the question, wrote strongly on it, and urged that there should be no hesitation in an endeavour to ascertain the real cause of the trouble, and, on discovering the cause, to immediately apply a remedy. Nearly a quarter of a century has passed, yet nothing has been done to remedy the waste of men. At the present time there are a number of desertions in respect to which the authorities confess to being unable to discover the causes of discontent; even now large numbers of recruits are invalided after less than twelve months' training. The War Office has earned a reputation for moving slowly—indeed, for not moving at all—which the responsible authorities seem unwilling to let go. Are they proud of it? It is a very sad state of things.

The other day I came across a paper by Surgeon-Colonel F. Arthur Davy, which appeared as an appendix to the Army Medical Report for 1876. This paper was a contribution to the etiology of heart disease in the Army. The writer endeavoured to show that the course of drill which recruits were compelled to undergo was very apt to lay the foundation of much heart disease in the Army. I read the paper through, and wondered whether or not the chief cause of the waste of the Army was to be found in the findings of the author of this paper. One of the first paragraphs in the essay stated

that cardiac irritability resulting from deranged innervation of the organ, irregularity of rhythm, inequality in strength in the cardiac contractions, as well as hypertrophy and dilatation, with their possible consequences to the efficiency of the valves and to the aorta, in a great proportion of the number of cases invalided, have their starting-point in the orders of the drill-sergeant; and that, in obedience to his instructions, mechanical obstruction and strain are imposed on organs (especially on the heart) the integrity of which it should be the object of all training to preserve.

Since reading the essay from which these quotations are given, I sought and secured an interview with Surgeon-Colonel Davy, who willingly supplied information as to the results of his latest investigations on this most important subject. Letters were shown to me as evidence that Surgeon-Colonel Davy's diagnosis of the case had been endorsed by the late Dr. Walshe; also by the late Dr. Hilton Fagge, whose valuable work on medicine now is a household treasure. In this last-mentioned work Dr. Hilton Fagge says:

The general opinion was that the cause of cardiac affections among soldiers lay in the cross-belts, heavy accoutrements, and in the tight clothing which the men used to wear, and on the urgent advice of Dr. Maclean and Dr. Parkes the old knapsack was abolished and a valise equipment adopted in its stead.

Dr. Fagge then goes on to remark that, in spite of this change in the accoutrements worn by the soldiers, the prevalence of cardiac

dilatation and hypertrophy among recruits has not been diminished. Dr. Fagge continues :

Dr. Veale assigns these affections to no fewer than seventeen more or less distinct causes ; but it seems to me far more likely that some one cause is really responsible, and I am very much disposed to think that the real solution of the difficulty has been found by Surgeon-Colonel F. A. Davy, who holds the 'setting-up' drill to be mainly responsible. During this drill recruits are compelled to swell the chest, so as to artificially expand it. To this they are subjected for four hours a day for a period of about six months, having to march and even to double, with the chest in an abnormal condition.

Dr. Davy assured me, in the course of the interview which forms the basis of this article, that the same state of things still obtains. The drill for recruits is just the same as before in respect to this artificial expansion of the chest. In consequence of the prevention of free expiration, the functions of the lungs and of the heart are very seriously interfered with. Soldiers under drill, even when they are standing, have the frequency of the respirations increased to about 40, and the pulse to 110 in the minute ; the heart's rhythm is disturbed and the impulse of the organ is altered in position, is more forcible, and is felt over an unnaturally wide area. Dr. Davy says he often has seen recruits perfectly exhausted after their morning's drill, which ought not to be the effect upon healthy young men. The drill-sergeants, who, naturally, are not aware of the injury they are causing to the men's physique, believe they are 'making men' of the recruits whose figures, at first, are not in accordance with the popular idea of what a soldier's physique should be. Any recruit in the squad who does not have his chest prominently thrown forward and fully expanded soon has his attention called to the fact. The capacity of the chest, of course, is 'improved,' according to the ideas of the drill-sergeant, but in all common-sense this improvement can be of no advantage when obtained at the expense of its mobility. As a matter of fact, the 'setting-up' drill which still obtains is absurd from whatever point of view it may be considered. It does not fit the soldier for any task which he may be called upon to perform, or for any particular strain or feat of endurance which may be his lot in time of war. It would be well if it could be ascertained, and agreed upon, as to what is the actual condition of the soldier in the ranks from the moment he commences actual work on the battlefield until such action terminates. Drill instructors might work back from that to the goose-step.

Recent contributions to the daily newspapers, from miscellaneous authorities who have taken part in recent controversy on the subject of the course of training best suitable for recruits, have indicated that the proportion of recruits who desert or are invalided within the first twelve months after they have joined is greater to-day than it was when public attention was first drawn to the matter by Dr. Davy

and others whom I have mentioned. Dr. Davy informs me that the men who escape heart affections are those whose appearance at once satisfies the drill-instructor and who are not made to undergo these extraordinary chest exercises, or they are men who do not, because of the physical distress it causes them, obey the orders. The man who never knew he had a heart (an expression many a soldier has used to Dr. Davy) becomes aware of his possession after a few months' dilating drill. He blames his recently-donned pack and traps for his trouble, forgetting that as a civilian he could have carried them across country for ten or fifteen miles without any physical distress. Dr. Davy asserts that hypertrophy is very common in the Army, and is brought about by the drill imposed. The pack and other accoutrements may bring the mischief to light, but they have only aggravated what they have been supposed to originate—namely, the excess of heart disease which obtains in military as compared with civil life. The soldier ought to have the advantage, but he has not. Dr. Davy says he has proved that the civilian can accomplish a distance and carry a weight with less distress than the soldier. And this simply because the soldier has been 'trained.'

Dr. Davy says that this abuse obtains more in the Foot Guards than in any other regiment, because it is in the Foot Guards that these chest exercises are insisted upon most rigorously. The best test of the capability of a soldier for undergoing physical exertion is to be found in the condition of his heart and lungs under such exertion—in the condition of his circulation; for the lungs are a portion of the circulation. It is quite impossible to judge of a man's powers of endurance by simply looking at him. He may look big and strong, and he will be big-chested if he be a soldier; but, to test the matter, let him, after a march, in marching order, of from ten to fifteen miles, be told to throw off his pack and double up an incline, rifle in hand, and, carrying from twenty-five to thirty rounds of ammunition, commence firing at once at a target 300 yards distant. This is nothing that might not be required of the soldier in time of active warfare. Dr. Davy says that the trained men—that is, the men who have been under the drill-sergeant for some months—are few and far between who will accomplish the feat. But he insists that these simple exercises should be adopted on every second or third day, and that on the intervening days the men should be taught military manoeuvres and movements, instead of sending them to the dilating sergeant. The point is this, that Medical Officers pass men as recruits for the Service who are expected to become efficient soldiers, but it would appear to be a settled matter in the military mind that the civilian shape will not do in uniform. The men must be altered somehow to fit their new clothes. They must be provided with an appearance—and a condition of heart—which would have caused their rejection had they presented it when being examined for enlistment. Can the required

soldierly bearing not be attained without prejudice to the well-being of the soldier? The answer to this depends upon what the authorities regard as a soldierly bearing; on whether the dilated, prominent thorax—for this is the sole evil—is a *sine qua non*. Dr. Davy suggests these plain directions by which injury to recruits can be altogether avoided:

(1) Start from a basis of real military necessity: sending the men to practise only such work and exercises as they are liable to be called on to do; excluding the artificial evils spoken of—namely (a) chest dilatation; (b) directing attention to the manner of disposing the weight of the body; (c) extension motions for opening chest. (2) Abandon the false idea of human perfection of figure, as it is now supposed to be exemplified by the 'position of the soldier;' and instruct the drill-sergeant to improve the faulty symmetry of awkward-looking men by directing their attention, not to their chests, but to the fault—whether unequal height of shoulders, head held too much forward—whatever the fault may be. (3) Corrections of the above kind to be made not exclusively when men are standing, but chiefly when they are practising military movements and evolutions; for thus the great disadvantage is got over of keeping men long standing still. (4) As the soldier is a man whom we select, and whom, having selected, we are bound to further prepare for hard work, let us see that he practises it—making marching and running the chief items in the training—but that he does so under natural and not artificial conditions; under conditions, above all, which allow of no interference with the important functions of the heart and lungs.

These simple directions apply to men already in the Service as well as to recruits now joining and yet to join. That soldiers should possess a manly bearing and be free from any unsightly trick of attitude is a proposition in which all must agree, but any such trick or peculiarity surely might be remedied without injury to the man exhibiting it.

A. FRANCIS WALKER.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I am at liberty to state that Colonel Pollock, in connection with his experiment at Hounslow, did without the chest-swelling exercises for his recruits, and that he attributes the physical fitness of the men, in a great measure, to that fact. I also am at liberty to add that the attention of the Secretary for War has been called to the injurious effect of the old system of recruit drill, and that it is probable that important changes shortly will take place in the routine for the Regulars, leading to the total abolition of the exercises for artificial chest-inflation. This is good to hear, for it must go far towards the solution of the great problem of economy in the maintenance of our military forces.

A. F. W.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

THE present Parliament has already shown that it is the most progressive and the most democratic in our history. In its spirit as in its composition, the House of Commons of 1906 is distinctly a new departure. Though there may be again, as in the past, periods of temporary rest, and possibly fits of reaction, the democracy, having once awakened to life and realised its power, is not likely to lapse again into the deep slumber and apathy of the last few years.

The huge Liberal majority—the largest since the first Reform Bill; the striking accession to the ranks of the Labour representatives; the earnest spirit of reform which animates the Government and its supporters, all inspire the hope that something effective will be done to grapple with the great social evils which weaken the nation and crush the less fortunate part of our population. Great is the need for social reform, and the expectations are great. Already important labour measures, such as the Trade Disputes Bill and the amendment of the Workmen's Compensation Act, have been introduced and bid fair to become law this session.

Multitudinous and clamorous are the social reforms which demand the attention of Parliament. In this article I shall confine myself to one of these—the supreme importance of old-age pensions and the urgent need that we should make better State provision for our aged poor.

Even when thus narrowed, the subject is still large, complex, and by no means easy of solution. But whatever the difficulties, they must be courageously faced and overcome. The problem is not a new one. The brilliant author of *Robinson Crusoe* outlined a pension scheme to provide 'subsistence for the poor and infirm whenever age or disablement should reduce them to the necessity of making use of it.' Thomas Paine, and other eminent publicists, including several members of Parliament and statesmen, pressed the subject upon public attention in the closing years of the eighteenth century. Well nigh two hundred years have elapsed since Daniel Defoe wrote, and it is nearly a century since Paine died. In the interval our country has been transformed from a small community, almost wholly agricultural, into a great manufacturing, mining, industrial nation—

one of the greatest on the face of the globe. In population, in national income, in accumulated wealth, we have made enormous strides. Within living memory, too, the general condition of our working people has greatly improved; wages have increased, the hours of labour have been shortened, the standard of living has been raised. But this general prosperity has been accompanied by the black shadow of periodical if not of chronic unemployment, and, worse still, by the steady continuous increase in the numbers of the unemployable. Beyond all question the strain and stress, the rush and pressure of our modern industrial life bear more and more hardly upon the infirm and the aged. Though our average longevity increases, the age of effective work in many industries steadily and gradually diminishes. Year after year it becomes more and more difficult for the aged and the ageing to obtain and to retain their employment. In the vicissitudes and fluctuations of trade they are the first to be dismissed and the last to be re-employed. Hence the urgent and admitted necessity that something shall be done to heal this sore malady in the body politic. The next great reform in our poor-law system must include Old-Age Pensions.

Few persons, except those who have carefully examined into the subject, can be aware to what an enormous extent pauperism is due to old age. In the prime and vigour of life our workpeople are in the main self-reliant and self-supporting. Decade after decade pauperism has been decreasing until, relatively to population, it is only about one-half of what it was fifty years ago. Meanwhile the poverty and dependence due to age is stationary, if not increasing. I do not wish needlessly to trouble the reader with figures, but I must give a few. They are grim and incontrovertible. In 1890 a Parliamentary Return for which I moved showed that on the 1st of August of that year 41,180 persons between the ages of sixty and sixty-five and 245,687 over the age of sixty-five were in receipt of parish relief. My Return of 1890 was in the main confirmed by another Return which I obtained in 1904. So far as aged poverty is concerned, these results were slightly worse than those revealed by the earlier Return.

Mr. Charles Booth, a very high authority, after a careful analysis, inferred from these official figures that 'not less than one-third of the working class over sixty-five years of age were to a greater or less extent dependent on public relief in 1890.' Another eminent authority, Sir Spencer Walpole, in a striking memorandum which he laid before Lord Rothschild's Old-Age Pension Committee, of which he was a member, stated that 'one person out of every five, of sixty-five years and over, had received public relief on a particular day in 1892; that one out of three of that age had applied for relief in the course of the year; and that, deducting the well to do, one working man or woman out of every two are more or less dependent on the rates in their old age.'

Action rather than further investigation is therefore now imperatively required. From 1895 to 1900 there were no fewer than four Royal Commissions and Committees of Inquiry. Of the Royal Commission in 1895 his Majesty the King, then Prince of Wales, was a member, and he took the keenest interest in the investigations. No sooner had that Commission reported than a Committee of which Lord Rothschild was chairman was appointed. That again was quickly followed by Mr. Chaplin's Committee, which again was succeeded a year afterwards by a departmental Committee on the aged deserving poor. No practical recommendations emanated from the Royal Commission. But the inquiries were not in vain. The crying evils of our poor-law system were exposed, grievous sores were laid bare, the need for action was confirmed. The facts elicited showed conclusively that poverty in age is not wholly or mainly due, as is often so cruelly alleged, to vice, intemperance, and thriftlessness. It was proved beyond controversy that great numbers of our population have incomes so scanty that it is practically impossible for them to make provision for their declining years. It has been stated on high authority that about one-third of our workers have to live upon a pound a week. Thrift does not necessarily mean saving. It means good management, and with the meagre incomes of our agricultural labourers, and of large numbers of our unskilled workers, there is unmistakable thrift when they rear their families in anything like decency, without saving for their old age. Contributory schemes for Old-Age Pensions are therefore ruled out by the stern logic of facts.

While we in Great Britain have been investigating, debating, passing resolutions, making election promises, other countries have been acting. Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, Denmark, our own New Zealand and Australian Colonies have all in recent years done something practical by legislation and administration to provide for their aged poor. Claiming as we do to be ahead of other nations in social reforms, we certainly, in respect to care for the aged, lag far and discredibly behind nearly every civilised nation in the world.

It is quite true that our poor-law Statutes go back for many hundreds of years. By our common law we have recognised from remote time that none of our people should be allowed to 'die for default of sustenance.' That is well so far as it goes. But nearly all our poor-law legislation has been tainted with the notion that poverty and vice are synonymous. Tennyson's *Northern Farmer* sums up in a line the orthodox view of the British Philistine: 'Taake my word for it, Sammy, the poor in a loomp is bad.' Hence we have indiscriminately attached all sorts of stigmas, disabilities, and disfranchisements to the recipients of poor-law relief.

In referring to other countries I do not say or imply that we can in every respect follow their example. We cannot, nor ought we to

do so. From them we may learn something, but we must solve our own problems in our own way. Many of these countries are necessarily acting tentatively. It cannot be pretended that their schemes are working with entire smoothness or complete satisfaction. Many of them are amending their Acts by the light of further experience, but nowhere is there a suggestion that they should go back on their past, and abolish their Old-Age Pension legislation.

The Royal Commission, whose examination into the facts was most careful and searching, considered more than a hundred different proposals for Old-Age Pensions. None of these met with their approval, nor were they able, 'after repeated attempts,' to formulate a scheme of their own which was 'free from grave inherent disadvantages.'

Mr. Chamberlain, who has for many years advocated pensions for the aged, and who, vastly to his credit, has devoted much time and labour to the subject, once declared that the matter was one of extreme simplicity. A proposal such as his, which demands a lump payment of five pounds at the age of twenty-five and an annual subscription of one pound for forty years, may indeed be simple, but as a solution of the Old-Age Problem it is wholly impracticable.

The Select Committee of 1899 recommended an Old-Age Pension scheme to give not less than five shillings, or more than seven shillings, a week to persons of sixty-five years of age who fulfilled certain specified conditions. No estimate of the cost of carrying out the scheme was then given, but the Departmental Committee of experts who subsequently inquired into its financial side estimated that in 1901 the amount required would be 10,300,000*l.*, and in 1911 it would rise to 12,650,000*l.* Mr. Asquith, answering a question put to him early this session, said that on this basis the present cost would probably not be far short of 11,500,000*l.*

The plan which has taken the strongest hold of the workpeople is that put forward by Mr. Charles Booth. Mr. Booth is no mere dreamer and theorist; he is a trained economist and a practical commercial man. Like all true social reformers, from Robert Owen to General Booth, he combines love of his fellow-men with shrewd business faculty. Universality is the essence of Mr. Booth's scheme. Speaking roughly, every naturalised British subject legally certified to be over sixty-five years of age, who had resided continuously in the United Kingdom for twenty years previous to the date of application, who was not a criminal, a lunatic, an imbecile, or a hopeless drunkard, would be entitled to claim a pension of five shillings per week. Mr. Booth's proposals have been approved by many large representative Conferences, of Trade Unionists, Co-operators, members of Friendly Societies in all the great industrial centres throughout the country, as well as by the Trades Union and the Co-operative Annual Congresses. The scheme has the merit of simplicity, but the cost certainly would

be very large, even for one of the richest countries in the world. According to the census of 1901 there were 2,018,716 persons in the United Kingdom who were over sixty-five years of age. To give five shillings per week to all would mean the expenditure of 26,225,000*l.* a year.

From this total there would of course be large deductions. The pension having to be formally claimed in person, the rich and well-to-do would not be likely to apply. Those already in receipt of pensions would be excluded; the large amount now spent on pauperism would be diminished, out-door relief being practically abolished. Still, let it be frankly recognised that any effective scheme of Old-Age Pensions must inevitably mean large expenditure. And when we speak of fifteen or twenty millions a year, unless it be to slay and destroy men, many worthy people are apt to be startled and appalled. Every scheme yet put forward, every conceivable scheme indeed, may doubtless be riddled by the expert critic. Criticism is proverbially easy. 'A man must serve his time to every trade save censure; critics all are ready made.'

It is alleged that a general Old-Age Pension system would discourage if not destroy thrift; that it would tend to lower wages and would produce universal pauperism. No proof is advanced to sustain these sweeping statements. Much of the evidence given before the Royal Commission and the Committee of Inquiry negatives them. On the face of it the assumption is absurd that the competition of persons over sixty-five years of age could have any appreciable effect on the general rate of wages.

The high moralists who are so fearfully perturbed lest the aged workers should be demoralised by the payment to them of five shillings per week seem to be unaware or forgetful of the fact that some eight million pounds a year is now paid in pensions to certain specially favoured individuals. It is never suggested that these fortunate recipients, many of them fairly well to do and not a few of whom are paid hundreds or thousands a year, are pauperised, degraded or rendered thriftless by what they receive from the State. Oh, but these persons, it is replied, have served their country on the battlefield, in the legislative chambers, or as Government officials. No doubt that is true of many of them. But when service to their country is justly enough advanced as a reason for a special reward, on what principle is the worn-out toiler, who has contributed to the production of the nation's wealth, to be excluded from participation in a similar reward? 'A labourer serves his country with his spade just as a man in the middle ranks of life serves it with his sword, his pen, his brain, or his lancet. If the service be less, and therefore the wages during health less, then the reward when health is broken may be less, but not less honourable.' John Ruskin, from whom I quote, goes on to say that it 'ought to be

quite as natural and straightforward for a labourer to take his pension from his parish, because he has deserved well of his parish, as for a man of higher rank to take his pension from his country because he has deserved well of his country.' That is our contention, only we should include the woman as well as the man, and we should substitute country for parish, an alteration which does not invalidate the principle laid down by Ruskin.

I agree that anything which tends to weaken or discourage habits of thrift is to be deprecated. The sad truth must be acknowledged and deplored that great numbers are brought to poverty and destitution by improvidence and intemperance, drink playing sad havoc in many ways. But it is equally true that heroic efforts are made by tens of thousands of ill-paid wage-earners to maintain their independence and to live without assistance from the poor-rates. Sometimes these efforts succeed; often they fail.

It may be doubted whether the public generally are fully aware of what is already being done for the aged by working men through their Trade Unions and other great self-help organisations. Let me give a few figures. I find from the last issue of the Labour Statistics published by the Board of Trade, that in 1901—the last year for which the facts are available—forty of the principal Trade Unions paid no less a sum than 267,396*l.* in superannuation benefit. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers itself is paying more than one hundred thousand pounds a year to its aged members. All this is in addition to large expenditure on the unemployed, which again is no doubt greatly swelled by those who are made workless through old age. The Northumberland and Durham Miners' Permanent Relief Fund has for many years made provision for its aged members. In 1905 there were 4,591 on the fund, the total amount paid in superannuation for the year being 60,094*l.* Whether a general Old-Age Pension scheme be adopted or not these societies will continue the noble work which they have begun. But after all, creditable though all this is to the humanity and to the organising faculty of those concerned, the evil is hardly touched by these voluntary associations.

This article, longer than I had intended, and more fragmentary than I could have desired, must now be concluded. It has been established beyond all controversy that hundreds of thousands of our people, after having spent the best years of their life in the service of their country as wealth-producers, are left destitute in their old age through no fault of their own; that, though much is done by their friends and relatives, by Trade Unions, Friendly Societies, and other thrift agencies, these beneficent efforts scarcely touch the great mass of poverty which is due to age, and to the infirmities which accompany age. It is further recognised, alike by supporters and opponents, that the subject can be adequately dealt with only by a universal pension scheme, which will draw no fine cobweb distinction between

the deserving and the undeserving poor. Moreover, leading statesmen of both the great political parties have at one time or another promised legislation on the subject of Old-Age Pensions.

The present Government, I have reason to believe, will earnestly endeavour to solve the problem. In some respects the time is opportune for action. The Labour members, now happily a force in Parliament, are united and earnest in their support of Old-Age Pensions. The majority of Liberals, as well as many Conservatives, take the same view. In sentiment therefore there is general if not complete agreement. The difficulties are admittedly great, but they are mainly, if not entirely, financial. With unity and courage these difficulties can be surmounted. There must be, and there will be, I hope, important retrenchment, especially in naval and in military expenditure. New sources of income must be found, without throwing added burdens upon the workers and upon the producers of wealth. After negative criticism has said its strongest word there remains urgent need for prompt, effective action.

•

THOMAS BURT.

HALLEY'S AND OTHER COMETS

ABOUT eleven years ago, in this Review,¹ I endeavoured to show that the greatest marvel in Astronomy is not to be found in the immensity of the Stellar Universe, with its distances such as the mind can hardly grasp, or in the vast processes of evolution ever proceeding with greater or less rapidity in all its parts, but in that which is far more wonderful, as it meets the student at every step in his progress—viz. the intimate *intermingling* of the excessively small with the exceedingly great.

Since then the advance of physical science has, I venture to think, given much fresh support to this statement. That advance has been most remarkable for its penetration into the arcana of what is most minute. It is true that for more than a century past our view of every distant Sun, or Nebula, has been known to depend upon waves of light whose undulation-periods are hundreds of times less than a billionth of a second. It is true that, for about fifty years past, the spectroscope has shown that the more refined details of such light tell us, with a certainty independent of the vastness of the intervening space which the light may have traversed, of what materials each far-distant orb is made. But it has been discovered, only in the last few years, that the Astronomer must take into consideration the effects produced by individual portions of matter far more minute than any of which the existence had been previously imagined.

Until quite recently it had been supposed that the limit of all investigation, either of the chemical constitution, or of the luminous radiation of any heavenly body, must be bounded by the so-called elementary atoms of matter; such atoms being far too small to be rendered visible by the most powerful microscope, although their existence and properties could be otherwise demonstrated. But now the Astronomer finds that in the evolutionary processes of the Universe, or in the physical constitution and condition of any of its members, he must study movements, and vibrations, and energies of vast power, ever working inside or around these atoms, caused by flying particles, or electrons (as they are named), a thousand times smaller than the smallest atom previously known. And he must find out

¹ *The Nineteenth Century*, August 1895.

how to make these newly-discovered minutest particles, endowed each with its own constant and uniform charge of negative electricity, tell him what they are doing, what they have achieved, and towards what most important ends they are working throughout the Universe.

The New Astronomy of the present day is most closely related to the sciences of Electricity and Magnetism; to the action of Light and Heat and of every kind of Radiation; and to the inmost constitution of Matter. And the more all these are studied the more important is that which is excessively minute found to be in every one of them. Further, it is, I think, exceedingly interesting that this astronomical importance of the very minute shows itself most notably in those members of the Universe which are most remarkable for the immensity of their dimensions. It is so, for instance, in the Nebulæ, and in those Stars whose vaporous surroundings are of enormous extension, owing to their being in an early and semi-nebulous stage of evolution. Again, in the Corona of the Sun, the outer boundary of which, under the form of the Zodiacal Light, may even pass beyond the Earth. And, once more, in the huge development both of head and tail very frequently met with in the fascinating class of objects termed Comets.

The head of a Comet in general consists of a denser and brighter central part (or Nucleus) with an extensive nebulous surrounding. This outer portion of the head in times past seemed suggestive of a mass of hair. It is therefore called the Coma. From this the tail springs forth, often to a very great distance. Hence the name of Comet, or long-haired. The tail was also formerly often called the 'Blaze;' and a Comet termed a Blazing Star.

The Coma of the head is frequently of very large size; that, for instance, of the grand Comet of A.D. 1811 being considerably more than a million of miles in diameter. But far more remarkable dimensions are met with in the tails. The great Comet of A.D. 1843 had a tail of about 200 millions of miles in its visible length, while it was doubtless only the faintness of the light of its farther portions that prevented its being traced to a much greater distance. The whole volume of such a tail was perhaps of somewhat less surprising magnitude, although its diameter was more than three millions of miles. It is not, however, so much volume, as linear extension, which is of most importance in connection with recent theories of radiation, and with those new developments in science to which I have alluded. Other tails have attained to 50, 100, 150, or more millions of miles; while the length of many more has been sufficiently great to be of the highest interest to the physical student.

Any such numerical statements, however, call for a few remarks as to the relation of Comets to geometrical, as well as to physical, Astronomy: for the estimate of the actual size of a Comet, or of any part of it, at any given moment, must clearly depend upon

our knowledge of our distance from it at that time. It is by making due allowance for the effect of that distance that the actual size is determined which corresponds to the apparent size observed by the eye. Knowing, as we do, the Earth's position in its own orbit, we proceed to calculate geometrically the form and position of the Comet's orbit around the Sun. We are then able at once to deduce the Comet's distance at any moment from the Earth.

In the history of Astronomy the geometrical calculation of Cometary orbits is of exceeding interest. Newton's great discovery of the Law of Gravitation went far beyond the explanation of the cause of the three laws of the planetary movements which Kepler had detected by his study of a mass of previous observations. Newton not only showed that gravitation demanded those laws for planets moving after the manner of those then known (*i.e.* in elliptic orbits of very moderate ovalness or eccentricity); but he also demonstrated that the same law of gravitation would permit and control movement in an ellipse of *any* degree of ovalness, or even in a parabolic or hyperbolic orbit. The Sun must occupy what is termed a focus of any such orbit. This in the case of an elongated ellipse is a point situated near to one end of the longest diameter of the curve.

Newton applied his theory himself to some extent with reference to a great Comet which was seen in the year 1680; showing how, in that or in any other similar case, an approximate calculation of the orbit might be made. Soon afterwards the celebrated astronomer Halley followed up a suggestion made by Newton (the two being intimate friends) that it would be well to determine, if possible, whether any Comets, moving in elongated orbits, had returned and shown themselves again, after an interval in which they had meanwhile performed one complete orbital revolution. Halley fortunately was able to find sufficient observations recorded to enable him to calculate that there was a great similarity between the orbital elements of two Comets, respectively seen in 1531 by Apian and in 1607 by Kepler, and those of a Comet which he himself had observed in 1682. This suggested that the same Comet might thus have appeared three times at intervals of seventy-five or seventy-six years. He also discovered that notable Comets had been seen in 1301, 1378, and 1456, for which the intervening intervals were nearly the same.² His investigations finally led him to predict that another passage of the same Comet through its nearest approach to the Sun would take place in the year 1759.

As that date drew nigh the confirmation of the application of the Law of Gravitation to this Comet's orbit, which was calculated to be an ellipse so elongated that one end of it would be about sixty times as far away from the Sun as the other, was anticipated with

² Owing to planetary perturbations it is found that the duration of the orbital period of Halley's Comet may vary from time to time by more than five hundred days.

great interest. A very elaborate computation of the path of the Comet was made, before the end of the year 1758, by the French astronomer Clairaut. Owing to the want of certain data, some uncertainty was, however, unavoidable. Nevertheless, the date of the perihelion passage, or nearest approach of the Comet to the Sun, was closely approximated to. After an absence of more than seventy-six years it passed through that important point of its orbit within about three weeks of the date calculated by Clairaut. He afterwards showed that he could have given the time with considerably greater accuracy, if he had known more correct values of the masses of Jupiter and Saturn, and had thereby been able to allow more precisely for the perturbation of the Comet's movement caused by their attraction as it passed near them.

Since that time the truth of Newton's great law has been abundantly confirmed in its application to the orbits of various other Comets, especially in the case of some which revolve wholly within the boundaries of the Solar System. Of such there is an inner group of about thirty, of which even those which go furthest away from the Sun pass but little beyond the distance of Jupiter, while their periods vary from about three and one-third, to rather more than twelve, years. The eccentricities of their orbits are in some cases not very different from those of some of the many Minor Planets discovered of late years. Altogether, their paths can be very accurately computed and tested. Nevertheless, Halley's Comet will always be renowned above all others for the intense interest which its return in 1759 excited: because that return tested, for the first time, not only the application of the theory of gravitation to the control of the Sun over a body moving in so elongated an orbit; but also the amount and effect of the perturbing attractions of Jupiter and Saturn in certain parts of the orbit.

Let us now consider a few other points of interest connected with this Comet, with especial reference to its next return in the year 1910.

After 1759 it appeared again in 1835. It was then possible to calculate its movements with so much greater accuracy that it made its perihelion passage within four days of the predicted date; indeed, some corrections afterwards applied left a discrepancy of only a single day. The Comet was not a very grand object to the naked eye; although the light of the nucleus decidedly surpassed that of second-magnitude stars; and was comparable with that of some reddish stars of the first magnitude, such as Aldebaran and Antares. The tail, while the Comet was approaching the Sun, attained to twenty degrees in length; and a very remarkable jet emitted by the nucleus was watched with great interest by telescopic observers. But after the Comet had passed to such a distance on the other side of the Sun that it was again visible to observers on the Earth, it

was seen to be devoid of a tail ; while the nucleus had expanded into an illuminated disc, which was surrounded by a hazy Coma. This disc gradually grew larger as the Comet receded from the Sun. The Coma at the same time gradually vanished away.

I have already referred to a probable apparition of Halley's Comet so early as the year A.D. 1301. It is also likely that it is the same as a Comet recorded in A.D. 1223 ; while it is almost certain, as the late Mr. Hind showed by careful study of Chinese and other records, that it was seen in the year 1145. It is generally identified with the great and very celebrated Comet of A.D. 1066, depicted in the Bayeux tapestry. Mr. Hind³ has also discussed fourteen probable appearances before A.D. 1066, beginning with one in B.C. 11 ; of which those of B.C. 11 and A.D. 218, 295, 451, and 760 are the most certain. Sometimes, as in A.D. 1456, it was terrible to behold. In that year, in spite of the twilight of summer, its tail was sixty degrees in length, and its aspect such that Pope Calixtus ordered special prayers to be offered up for protection both from the Turks under Mahomet the Second and from the Comet.

No very precise calculations have, I believe, yet been published of its path in 1910, or of the dates of its then nearest approaches to the Sun and to the Earth. It seems that some further investigation of the accuracy of one of the elements of the orbit, hitherto accepted, must be made, and much more elaborate computation be gone through. Dr. Smart, F.R.A.S., has, however, recently effected some approximate calculations of much interest,⁴ which show that in May 1910 it may probably rise about four hours before the Sun, and be a brilliant object with rapidly increasing light, so as to reach its brightest about the middle of June. It may, he says, pass near to the splendid star Capella, 'which may perhaps repeat with this Comet the beautiful spectacle which Arcturus made with Donati's in 1858.' During a portion of its visibility it is expected to be above the horizon during the whole of the day and the night, but it will probably not approach us within about one-fourth of the Earth's distance from the Sun. The twilight of the summer nights will unfortunately tend to diminish its beauty.

Some other very interesting details are also mentioned by Dr. Smart. For instance, that, if the Comet should approach the Sun within about two-thirds of the Earth's distance, its velocity when rushing through its perihelion passage would amount to about 1,878 miles per second ; while at its aphelion, or furthest distance from the Sun, it would only move through thirty-nine miles in a second. This difference of speed is, of course, very notable ; but, as Dr. Smart has remarked, the mere statement of it hardly suggests how much

³ *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, vol. x. p. 51.

⁴ *Journal of the British Astronomical Association*, vol. xii. p. 134, and vol. xvi. pp. 105 and 160.

of its whole period the Comet must in consequence spend in the further portion of its orbit. The planet Neptune is at about thirty times the Earth's distance from the Sun. The Comet in its aphelion attains only to about thirty-five times the Earth's distance, or one-sixth further. Yet it is calculated that it must take nearly one-half of its orbital period to describe the comparatively small part of its path which lies beyond that of Neptune. Its motion is what is termed retrograde, or in a direction* opposite to that of the planets around the Sun. It is only north of the plane of the ecliptic for about six months out of its whole period. At the present time it is somewhat farther from the Sun than the planet Saturn.

In 1910 the Comet may be a brighter and grander object than any which we have seen in this hemisphere since 1882; but it will not be at its nearest position to the Earth until after it has passed through its nearest approach to the Sun. If we might judge from the behaviour of various other Comets, this circumstance might suggest that it might then show much luminous disturbance and tail-development; but it is well to remember that, in 1835, it had a long tail before its perihelion passage, but none when seen again on the other side of the Sun. Its tail and its general brightness seem, however, to have varied so much in its different apparitions that it may well be hoped that the Comet will be of considerable, if not of surpassing, grandeur to the naked eye in 1910; while it will certainly be of the utmost interest to telescopic observers.

We must not forget, it is true, that out of the number of much fainter Comets, having comparatively short periods, which have been recently discovered, about twelve have made two, or more, successive appearances. Two others, of periods very similar to that of Halley's, have also each been seen twice; one in the years 1812, and 1884; and one in 1815 and 1887.⁵ They are both, however, of little interest to the naked-eye observer. Halley's remains unique in its long-traced history and many reappearances. It can never be forgotten as the first seen to return again. Halley's name, apart from his other great achievements, will ever be famous for the prediction of its return fifty-four years before it occurred. It is also in itself a Comet of notable beauty, and grandeur, both of head and tail.

As regards Comets in general, the points of interest open to discussion are so numerous that I will only mention a few which have some special relation to the more recent developments of physical science. In doing so, let me first refer to the probable composition of the nucleus of a Comet's head.

There is a Comet the path of which, as Professor Schiaparelli has shown, agrees in a remarkable manner with the orbit in which a multitude of small meteorites, or shooting stars, can be proved to move,

* See *Remarkable Comets*, by W. T. Lynn. 11th ed. A small but valuable popular treatise.

some of which the Earth meets with every year in the second week of the month of August. This Comet was discovered by Professor Swift in July 1862, and is calculated to have a period of about 120 years in length. At its greatest distance from the Sun it therefore departs about half as far again as the orbit of Neptune. The meteorites referred to must be distributed with a fair amount of regularity all along the Comet's path, as the Earth meets with them every August—i.e. every time that it passes across the orbit in question.

A similar connection has been found between a small Comet of the year 1866 and a great display of shooting stars seen during many centuries past, up to the year 1866, at intervals of about thirty-three years, in the middle of the month of November, as in 1833, 1799, and previously. Unfortunately their orbit seems now to have been somewhat perturbed, so that they failed to appear in the numbers expected in, or near to, the year 1899. But the fact that, for long past, they have only appeared in great abundance once in each thirty-three years—or near to that date—indicates that they are not spread at all so uniformly along the orbit of the Comet of 1866 as are those found in the orbit of that of 1862. They must have been more closely aggregated along a much smaller portion of their orbit, and not greatly separated from their Comet.⁶

Passing by another similar but less important case, we find yet one more, still more remarkable and definite in its indication of a very close relation between Comets and Meteorites. There is a Comet known as Biela's. Although it had probably been seen on two previous occasions, its orbit was first computed in 1826, soon after its detection by Biela in that year. Its period was calculated to be somewhat more than six and a half years; and it was seen again in 1833. It was unfavourably situated and consequently not noticed in 1839. But it showed itself once more in 1846. Then about three weeks after its first detection in 1846, up to which time it had presented the appearance of a faint circular nebula with a small central condensation, it became of a pear-shaped form; and about a fortnight later was found to have split into two separate Comets, each having a short tail.

The two presently separated to a distance apart of about 150,000 miles. In 1852, so far as could be judged, these same two Comets were seen again; but the one was then about 1,250,000 miles from the other. In 1859 their position was unfavourable, and they were not found. In 1866 it was fully expected that one, if not both, would appear. But they failed to do so. In place of them, however, a

⁶ According to the period calculated for this Comet of 1866, it should have been seen again in 1899, when, as stated above, the shooting stars failed to appear. The Comet, however, was also not observed in that year. But the failure to see it was in all probability simply due to its unfavourable position for observation at that time.

display of shooting stars, or meteorites, took place at the end of November 1867. It was also found that three or four similar displays near to the same date in November had previously occurred; and it was possible satisfactorily to identify their orbit with that of the lost Comet. These same meteorites appeared again in many hundreds of thousands (coming apparently, as the nature of their path involved, from the constellation of Andromeda) towards the end of November 1872, and once more in 1885; thirteen complete terrestrial years, which are nearly equal to two of their orbital revolutions, bringing them back to much the same position relatively to the Earth. It must, however, be confessed that, owing either to their dispersion or to some perturbing influence, they too seem disposed, like the mid-November meteorites, to disappoint us now by failing to appear in any great abundance. But they must certainly have been intimately related to Biela's Comet.

What, then, do these various instances indicate? Surely very clearly that the nuclei of Comets are in general collections, or aggregations, of Meteorites, which are easily broken up into smaller groups, or gradually spread and dispersed along a Comet's path until it may at last happen that the Comet will be wholly dissipated, and be seen no more. In any case, dynamical considerations indicate that the meteorites must continue to travel very nearly in the Comet's orbit.

This hypothesis is confirmed by cases in which the nucleus in the head of a Comet has actually appeared to undergo division. In the Comet of 1618 it is recorded that the head was at first like a planetary disc, but presently the astronomer Cysatus saw it as a clustering group of starry points. The Comets of Olinda in 1860, and of Brooks in 1889, broke into two parts, somewhat as did Biela's. The nucleus of the great Comet of 1882 gradually broke into four portions, each of which it is quite conceivable may some day form a separate Comet. And I may add that there is an indication that something of the same kind, but upon a much grander scale, may very possibly have happened in time long past, in the fact that the great Comet of 1882 forms one of what may be termed a family of Comets. It is calculated that it is moving in approximately the same orbit with the great Comets of 1843, 1880, and 1887; and possibly with that of 1668. This orbital agreement suggests that they may all have originated in some much larger parent collection of matter (originally revolving in a similar orbit) from which they may have broken off in succession. One or two other somewhat similar instances of such a brotherhood in Comets might also be named.

But it may next be asked: If Comets are thus composed of aggregations of meteorites, of what size may we suppose the meteorites to be? The answer is: that their size will probably correspond with that of such meteorites as the Earth is constantly encountering. These

frequently fall upon it; being sometimes of a few pounds in weight; or occasionally attaining even to hundredweights, or tons, as is indicated by specimens found *in situ* in certain localities, although they may not actually have been seen to fall. But it is likely that the weight of by far the greater number may only attain to a grain or two, as is the case with most of those which traverse the Earth's atmosphere in the form of shooting stars.

A Comet's nucleus is therefore probably composed chiefly of stony fragments varying in size from that of the finest dust to that of rocks of considerable magnitude. At the same time portions of a more or less metallic composition may be intermingled.

Let us next suppose a Comet, possessed of a nucleus thus constituted, to come within the influence of the Sun's attraction, and gradually to approach the Earth. It will in general, when first faintly visible, look like a small round Nebula. In the further regions of space from which it has come it may be supposed to have been in a condition of extreme cold. Amongst the meteorites of which it is composed there may, therefore, be many frozen particles capable of vaporisation at higher temperatures. In cavities and interstices of the meteorites—as is found in some which fall upon the Earth—Hydrogen and other gases may be occluded. Presently it may approach very near to the Sun, although probably not so closely as the great Comet of 1843, which passed within about 100,000 miles of the Solar surface. Processes of much disturbance will be originated by this proximity, which in some cases may be of stupendous force. The Sun's heat and other radiations, and collisions among the meteorites of the Comet themselves, may evolve vapours and gases which may expand to a great distance.

The Coma may thus be gradually formed around the nucleus, partly by more gentle emanation, but partly by fierce explosions and fiery jets rushing out from the now brilliantly illuminated central part.

We cannot, however, primarily attribute any *very violent* disturbances to the effect of the collisions of the meteorites with each other; because the whole mass of a Comet is so small that the revolution of the constituent particles, around their common centre of gravity in the nucleus, would only generate such low velocities in them as would allow of no great violence in their mutual impacts. The very small density of a Comet also involves a very loose degree of aggregation in its meteorites, which would make their collisions infrequent; although such as might occur would necessarily generate such an amount of heat as would probably involve the discharge or formation of gas. We must, therefore, assign the disturbances produced mainly to the effect of the Sun's heat upon the previously very cold matter in the Comet.

Eruptions from the nucleus may take place in any direction. But they occur, as might be expected, most frequently towards

the Sun, because on that side most heat is received. When so erupted the matter sent forth is in general seen to be presently thrown back again in a curved path past the nucleus, so as to form a brilliant hollow envelope around it; the nucleus being within that part of the envelope which is most curved, and convex towards the Sun. Several such envelopes, outlying each other, are sometimes seen, which have been formed in succession from a series of explosions; the matter projected having attained to different elevations above the nucleus before being turned back.

These envelopes, produced in this way from jets first of all emitted *towards* the Sun, of course help to form the Comet's tail after they have passed back beyond the head. But it may be said: Would not this be even more the province of jets themselves emitted *rearwards*, as some certainly are? Not at all necessarily. The more natural procedure (unless the velocity of its projection backwards were very considerable) would be that such ejected matter, as far as the effect of gravity in the Comet is concerned, and apart from any other influence, should presently fall back again on to the head. The matter forming the tail, however, seems to rush, as a rule, almost directly *away* from the Sun. A much smaller amount of ejected matter, probably of a different kind, is sometimes seen on the Sunward side of the head, like a tail pointing towards the Sun, and has occasionally been termed the Comet's beard. But the tail proper, frequently of immense extension, and always of almost inconceivably light density, invariably points away from the Sun; so that it even travels, in a sense, in front of the Comet after the perihelion passage has taken place and the Comet has begun to recede from the Sun again.

All this very clearly indicates, as nearly all astronomers have long allowed, that some great Repulsive Force emanates from the Sun, which drives away, with enormous speed, in the opposite direction, any matter ejected towards the Sun from the Comet's nucleus, after it has risen to a certain elevation: while the same force, if such matter is ejected in any other direction from the nucleus, sooner or later turns it all, in like manner, backwards into the tail.

When a tail is nearly, or altogether, absent in a Comet, the cause may be in the smallness of the Comet, or in the nature of its constituent matter, or in the want of a nearer approach to the Sun. In any case the hypothesis of the powerful Solar repulsive action, to which I have referred, is supported by the fact that the Comets which approach the Sun most closely are those which in general develop the longest and grandest tails. They also often do so with extraordinary rapidity. In the tail of one such Comet, that of 1680, it was calculated that matter traversed the whole length, a hundred millions of miles, in from two to four days. Another tail, that of the Comet of 1843 (which made the nearest approach to the Sun

yet observed), rushed out, in less than three weeks, to a length of 200 millions of miles.

By the tail of a Comet it should, however, be noticed that a complex formation is often meant. The tail may be multiform. Or, in other words, there may, at the same time, be more than one tail. A little consideration will show that this may be due to particles of matter being ejected from the head of such differing qualities, or in such differing physical conditions, as would cause the Solar repulsion to be much more energetic in its action upon some of them than upon others. Those most affected would be driven back most rapidly. Slight differences in the speeds so produced would simply cause a tail to broaden out in its further parts; because some of the particles, as they receded, would be left rather more behind than others in comparison with the direction of a line at any time joining the Comet and the Sun. It would also result that the tail would be somewhat curved in a direction opposite to that of the Comet's onward motion. Both these effects were beautifully exhibited in the main tail of Donati's Comet in 1858, and in that of the great Comet of 1882. But any *very decided* difference in the repulsive action on some of the particles might cause an altogether separate tail to be formed by them. And, if the repulsive effect were very intense indeed, an additional and *very narrow* tail might be driven back with such violence as hardly to be broadened or curved at all. Two such were seen in Donati's Comet. On the other hand, a much smaller repulsive effect may sometimes produce an extra tail, or tails, of a broader and shorter form, and also much more curved than the principal tail. But it should be noticed that sometimes additional tails may be due, to some extent, to an original difference of direction in some violently eruptive jet from which they have taken their origin.

All such phenomena of envelopes surrounding the nucleus, or of various forms and kinds of tails, call for explanation; as also the remarkable manner in which the Coma of the head sometimes diminishes in size as a Comet approaches the Sun, or enlarges as it recedes. It must no doubt be granted that the best attempts to explain such phenomena have not in general been very successful; but it is decidedly satisfactory that the most recent developments in physical science enable us very definitely to put on one side many theories of the past. We need no longer, for instance, consider whether Sunlight, refracted through the head, as through a lens, could produce the effect of the tail, by illuminating, as in a long ray, behind the Comet, dust-like particles supposed to be distributed throughout all the space through which it is passing; or whether (as I believe Newton thought) the tail might be a track of some of the more volatile portions of the Comet, carried up by a current, in the outer ethereal atmosphere of the Sun, caused by the Cometary particles,

when raised, to a very high temperature, communicating to that ethereal matter some of their own heat.

At the present time it may be granted that the all-important and effective action is some repulsive force due to the Sun ; intermingled, however, with the gravitating attraction both of the Sun and of the Comet itself, and with violent eruptive projection of matter from the Comet's nucleus. The chief question, therefore, for decision is : How does this repulsion arise ? To what is the great intensity of its action due ?

The reply to this question is found in the general acceptance now accorded to Clerk Maxwell's electro-magnetic theory of Light, supplemented by the thermo-dynamical and mathematical investigations of Bertoli, Larmor and other scientists ; according to which the mechanical pressure⁷ caused by the radiation of the Sun's Light, or by other similar radiation of longer or shorter wave-lengths than those of its visible light, is sufficient to produce the observed cometary phenomena. To which it may be added, that it can be shown that the Solar Light-Radiation would very probably meet with constituent particles in a Comet of such differing qualities, as would cause it to exercise such repulsions upon them as would produce just those velocities in them which, Professor Brédikhine, of Moscow, proved, more than twenty-five years ago, would generate the three forms and curvatures most usually found in Comets' tails.

That the pressure in question, due to the Sun's radiation, can produce the observed intensity of repulsion, depends upon the fact that, although in itself very slight, it acts according to the *area* of the surface of any particle upon which it presses ; while the weight of any particle, or, in other words, the action of the Sun's gravity upon it, depends upon the *volume* of the particle. Surface varies as the square, and volume as the cube of linear dimensions. If, then, the side of a cubical particle, upon one face of which Light is directly shining, be only half as long as that of another such particle, the pressure of the Light upon the former will be one-fourth of what it is upon the other : but the weight of the smaller will be one-eighth of that of the larger particle ($\frac{1}{4}$ being the square, and $\frac{1}{8}$ the cube, of $\frac{1}{2}$). Consequently the pressure will be proportionally twice as great, in comparison with the weight, in the case of the smaller particle. By supposing particles smaller and smaller, it is evident that the pressure may at last equal, and then surpass, the weight. It is therefore only necessary for a particle of any kind of matter to be sufficiently small, in order that the pressure of the Sun's Light-Radiation may exceed that of the Sun's gravitating attraction

⁷ The magnitude of this pressure, first theoretically calculated by Maxwell in 1873, has recently been tested experimentally by certain most refined methods, quite independently by Lebedew, and by Nichols and Hull. The values thus obtained from experiment and from theory are in remarkably satisfactory agreement.

upon it; in other words, for it to be *repelled* instead of being attracted.

It should further be mentioned that if a particle of a cubical shape were so small that the light-pressure on one face just equalled the gravitating attraction of the Sun upon it, a *spherical* particle of the same material might have a diameter about half as large again as the side of the cube, and the light-pressure would still balance the effect of the Sun's gravity upon it. The nearer any such small particles might be to the Sun the more violent the repulsive effect would necessarily be. But both the repulsion and the Sun's gravitating attraction would always vary inversely as the square of the distance from the Sun, and consequently always bear the same *ratio* to one another wherever a given particle might be. If the light-pressure had the mastery at any given distance from the Sun, it would have an exactly proportionate mastery, and consequent repelling effect, at any other distance. A particle once repelled would therefore continue to be driven further and further away, with a speed which, it may be shown, would continually increase until it approached a certain limiting value at a great distance.

This repulsive action will produce very great speeds. If a particle were only so small that the pressure upon it at the Sun's surface should be just double as great as its weight, it can be calculated that it would attain a velocity of 270 miles per second, by the time that it had been driven away to a distance equal to the Sun's radius (*i.e.* to about 430,000 miles); and that it would be driven to double that distance in less than an hour.

By comparing the directions of the tails of various Comets with the onward speed of the head in its orbit, Brédikhine and others have computed that the repulsive Solar action upon different kinds, or conditions, of matter in the tails must in general be between one and a half, and eighteen and a half, times the Sun's attraction. In any case, however, the effect of the repulsive action will not only depend, as already explained, upon the *size* of a given particle (it being greater, as I have shown, as the particle's diameter is diminished), but also upon its *density*. That is to say, it will not overcome the weight of a particle of a heavier material unless the particle be still smaller than it would have to be if it were of a lighter material. And in all these statements it must further be supposed that solid or liquid particles are under consideration, for which it may also be proved that the effect is increased the more fully they reflect the Light which falls upon them. In the case of gases the action is less fully known, and is supposed to be connected with a certain amount of what is termed selective light-absorption taking place in them.

It should also be mentioned that the repulsive action will again diminish if the smallness of the particles be reduced beyond a certain limit; because they then begin to produce certain effects termed

diffraction in the Light which falls upon them. The *maximum* attainable repulsion derived from the Sun's radiation is calculated to be about twenty times its gravitating attraction. But this degree of repulsion, acting while the head is moving onwards in its orbit, would be quite sufficient to produce the straightest and most rapidly generated (in other words, the most fiercely repelled) tail ever observed.

It may next be asked: Would such particles of matter have to be almost *inconceivably small* for the Sun's radiation to exercise a sufficiently powerful repulsion upon them? No! In the case of hydro-carbons, such as the spectroscope shows to be generally abundant in Comets, the particles would be of such density that they would only need to have diameters varying from about $\frac{1}{20000}$ to $\frac{1}{125000}$ of an inch. But particles smaller than these are certainly involved in some organisms revealed by the microscope; and much smaller ones can be proved by optical tests to exist in liquid films. It may, therefore, be confidently stated that in the radiations of the Sun's Light (as well as in its longer heat waves) there is an efficient cause for the violent repulsion of matter from the heads of Comets to form the vast extension of their tails.

But this may not be all. Other subsidiary causes may help, especially connected with some of the rays of shorter wave-length, beyond the Violet end of the visible spectrum. These are now known to be able to send forth with great velocities the newly discovered electrons or, as they are often termed, ions (or travellers) charged with, and perhaps even consisting of, negative electricity, whose mass is 1,000 times as small as that of the lightest atom known, viz. that of Hydrogen. These are probably ejected in constant streams from the surface of the Sun, as they are in the so-called Cathode rays which can be experimented upon by electrical discharges in exhausted tubes. They may form centres of aggregation for gaseous or vaporous atoms, or for very minute particles of cosmic dust, similarly to the way in which the watery vapour which forms an ordinary cloud is condensed upon multitudes of fine particles of matter. On reaching a Comet these ions, and atoms, may help to form its tail; or, if they meet with any other negatively electrified particles, they would help to drive them into the tail, because two negatively charged bodies always repel one another.

It is supposed that if such negative electrons, or ions, coming from the Sun, serve as centres of condensation, they may also, by entering the Comet's head in increasing abundance as it approaches the Sun, help so much the more rapidly to condense the vapours rising from the nucleus, as to cause the Coma occasionally to contract (which it sometimes does), instead of expanding, as might upon first thoughts seem more probable, under the influence of the greater heat received. Possibly also upon entering the head, or Coma, they may meet

with larger obstructive particles, and in colliding cause electric discharges, the action of which is indicated by the frequent brightness of the hydro-carbon spectrum of the head. . .

A further cause of tail-development may once more be found in the extra amount of heat which is received by that side of any particle in the Comet which is turned towards the Sun. From this a special emission of gases may take place on that side, the reaction due to which would drive the particles back by an effect similar to that by which a rocket is propelled. Some other kinds of gaseous repulsion may also act; while it is further possible that the ions from the Sun may exert an appreciable battering effect in the direction of their own movement, because of their numbers and their great speed. Nevertheless, after all, it is to the pressure of the Sun's Light-Radiation that, as previously explained, by far the most important part of the work done in forming a Comet's tail must be attributed.

As to the illumination of the tail less is known. The polariscope proves much of it to be reflected Sunlight; but all the action of the electrons and ions, and of such electric discharges as may take place and cause strong illumination in rarefied gases, together with the penetration of ultra-violet radiations, or of such as are generated by Uranium and Radium and their congeners, may well produce such fluorescence and luminescence, of various qualities, as shines forth in the beauty of the tail.

It has, I believe, been suggested, especially by the Swedish physicist Arrhenius, that electrons and ions may be ejected in unusual abundance where the Sun's surface is strongly disturbed in the region of its well-known Spot-zones. The intensity of the process would in that case experience a notable increase in years of Sun-spot maxima. If so, there may be some reason for a supposition which has been put forward, but at present, I think, on a very slight foundation, that Comets have been rather more easily detected when Sun-spots have been numerous. Mr. Maunder has, however, recently published much more weighty reasons for believing that great rays of electro-magnetic influence, projected from special localities on the Sun, may sweep repeatedly across the Earth when any such part of the Solar surface is brought round from time to time by the Sun's rotation on its axis.

It may, therefore, be well to keep careful watch in case any decided and unexpected brightening of the light of a Comet may at any time be noticed (as in some instances has certainly been recorded), either when the brilliancy of one of short period varies in its successive visits, or at different times during any given appearance. It would be of the greatest possible interest if any such variations of brightness should be found to synchronise with any special indications of magnetic emanations from the Sun; either connected with the abundance of its spots, or prominences; or due to such special discharges as

Mr. Maunder has indicated, from certain localised portions of its surface. If, moreover, a somewhat similar supposition be confirmed; viz.—that the pressure of the Sun's Light-Radiation, as well as the discharge of negatively electrified ions from its surface, is efficient in the formation of the vastly extended rays of its Corona; or even in the extension of the matter of the Zodiacal Light to about a hundred millions of miles from its surface;—this will all more and more confirm the probability of the explanation, which I have endeavoured to elucidate in this article, of the extraordinarily vigorous repulsion and rapid formation of the tails of Comets.

Very much more, however, still remains to be discovered. It is to be hoped that some great Comet may soon appear thoroughly well situated for observation. But, in any case, we may look forward with much expectation to the return of Halley's in less than four years' time.

Meanwhile smaller Comets may supply useful information. They tell us, at any rate, that tail-phenomena may depend, not only on what occurs in the Comet itself, but also upon its meeting with currents of other matter which it would seem must be drifting, or circulating, in the Solar System, or possibly in all space. Such drifting matter may be in the form of Nebulosities of excessively small density and wide extent, such as from time to time may produce the wonderful brilliancy of a so-called New, or Temporary, Star, if it meet with and pass through one of them.

Occasionally such sudden disruptive effects occur in the tail of a Comet, far away from its head (the most notable instance having been in the Comet of Brooks, on the 21st of October, 1893), as suggest that the delicate matter in the tail must have been torn asunder by its passage through some stream of nebulous, or other Cosmic, matter.

Comets themselves may indeed be but denser aggregations of such matter, dating from an epoch anterior to that of the development of the Sun and its Planets as a separate system. Their movements and orbits indicate that they are gradually drawn by the Sun, it may be only temporarily, but in many cases permanently, within the confines of our system. The Sun, however, in its onward progress through space, attended by the Planets, does not encounter most Comets on the side of its advance, as it would if they were themselves moving equally in all directions in space. The elements of their movements, on the contrary, indicate that, although they may come to us from beyond what are generally considered to be the boundaries of our system, they are mostly drifting along with it. They are therefore possibly the remains of a condition of things which originally gave that drift both to them and to the matter out of which our own system was subsequently formed.

This is an indication which once more increases the fascination of their study. But that fascination, felt for centuries past, has been

lately immensely enhanced, because their phenomena are at last being more and more successfully explained. • This is due, as I have shown, to those recent researches into the ultimate constitution of matter and electricity, which are carrying us far behind the minute chemical atoms long supposed to form the boundary of our studies; so that we can now investigate the complex action of constituent electrons, or corpuscles as some name them, of far more extreme minuteness, vibrating and circling within the confines of each atom. We may almost hope that we are on the verge of some great generalisation which may explain the very nature of gravitation itself, or of those other mighty energies which, by the aid of the most minute conceivable entities, are now found to bridge over the vastest of distances, and to link us with the furthest realms of space and the remotest Stars and Nebulæ. It is because of the special relation of the phenomena of Comets to all this New Knowledge; it is because we see within their huge confines the effects of transcendent energy upon matter in the most minute state of division; it is because we find in them indications of the joint action of Light-Pressure, Electricity, and Radiations of every kind, that they afford to the physicist one of the most encouraging fields in which to test his newest and deepest theories and discoveries. They 'teach as well as shine.'

F. LEDGER.

THE TRAINING OF AN ENGLISH GENTLEMAN IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS¹

THE first part of my duty, and the pleasantest, is to offer you, sir, my sincere thanks for your kindness in suggesting that I should give a lecture before this large audience, and, still more, in consenting to preside at it. For the title of the lecture the responsibility must rest upon yourself, or upon my old friend Mr. Inagaki, who introduced me to you. But to me it can be only a high privilege, if by any words of mine upon English education—a subject, as you have said, not unfamiliar to me—I can help, in however small a degree, to strengthen the sympathy between your country and my own. For there is an *entente cordiale* in arts as well as in arms; and it may be that the community of intellectual and moral ideals, if it can be realised, will prove in the end not the least potent factor of a lasting international alliance.

I do not know, indeed, that we in England are apt to dwell so much upon the ambition of becoming gentlemen as others may be who look at the English educational system from outside. The true gentleman is one who speaks and thinks as little as possible about gentility. The character of a gentleman is silently formed; it is the product of many subtle and almost secret influences; and never, perhaps, is it so perfect as when it is unconscious. Yet Tennyson, the poet who is the typical exponent of so much that is truest and highest in modern English thought, says of the friend whom his love has immortalised that

he bore without abuse
The grand old name of gentleman;

and what that friend was, all English youths, more or less, aspire to be.

You tell me, sir, that there is something in an English gentleman which has touched the imagination of Japan. If I am not wrong, the

¹ An address delivered in Tokio on the 12th of April, 1906, at the instance of the Minister of Education in Japan, Mr. Makino, who himself took the chair. It ought perhaps to be said that, as the address was not read from manuscript, it is here not verbally but substantially reproduced; and I have inserted in it two or three passages which were omitted, in order to save time, in the delivery.

Japanese students some time ago formed a society in the University of Cambridge, for the sole purpose of studying the character of an English gentleman. It does not perhaps altogether lend itself to imitation, except upon English soil and in the circumstances of English life. But you rightly hold that, such as it is, it is largely moulded by the public schools and the universities, and you wish me to speak chiefly of them. They are noble institutions, but they are not perfect. If it were necessary to criticise them in a single sentence I should say that they have generally proved more successful in the discipline of the character than in the cultivation of the intellect. But it remains true that the British Empire in its magnitude and importance is, and has long been, a commanding fact in human history; that, with many faults and not a few stains, it has yet been singularly successful in producing administrators of high character and capacity; and that most of them, or many, have traced the secret of their lives to the lessons which they learnt, or perhaps more truly to the spirit which they acquired, when they were still young, in the schools and colleges of Great Britain. A famous English statesman, Mr. Canning, once used these words: 'Foreigners often ask by what means an uninterrupted succession of men, qualified more or less eminently for the performance of parliamentary and official duties, is secured. First, I answer (with the prejudices perhaps of Eton and Oxford) that we owe it to our system of public schools and universities. From these institutions is derived (in the language of the prayer of our collegiate churches) "a due supply of men fitted to serve their country in Church and State." It is in her public schools and universities that the youth of England are, by a discipline which shallow judgments have sometimes attempted to undervalue, prepared for the duties of public life.'

It is not possible for me, within the limits of a single lecture, to examine in much detail the English type or types of scholastic and academical education. Neither the universities nor the public schools are all of one kind. Some universities are ancient, others are modern. In the former the students reside, for a shorter or longer portion of the year, away from their homes in small societies which are called colleges, or, if not in colleges, still under the special care of authorities belonging to the university. In the latter they generally live at home; the university is a local institution, and its office is not so much social or moral or spiritual as purely intellectual. But, even where universities are national, and students come to them from all parts of the United Kingdom, and, indeed, of the Empire, they may be widely different, as Oxford and Cambridge differ from the Scotch universities. I may pretty safely assume, however, that when the training of an English gentleman is in question, it is the universities of Oxford and Cambridge which are recognised as exercising a paramount influence among universities upon the national character; and it

happens that these are the universities which are best known to me.

Similarly the public schools may be divided into several classes, but chiefly into two. These are day schools, where the boys live at home with their parents, and spend only certain hours, but no more, a day under the immediate control of their masters. But the best-known schools are boarding schools: in these the boys live away from their homes for the greater part of the year, congregated in houses, as undergraduates are in colleges, and guided and governed, in all the various aspects of their lives, by masters who do for them what would in natural or normal circumstances be done by their parents. There are also schools in which the boys are partly boarders and partly day boys. One who has been concerned, as I have been, with schools of different kinds will not be disposed to argue that all the advantage lies with any one kind. But it is the boarding schools which are the peculiarly characteristic features of the English educational system. They do not, as the day schools do, find a close parallel in the schools of other European countries. Every such public school, indeed, has an individuality of its own. The Government exercises, or has exercised, so slight a control upon the schools that they have developed, for good or for evil, each upon its own special lines. The pupils of each school are distinguished by certain broad qualities which unite them, despite all differences of rank and age, to one another, and part them off from the pupils of all other schools. An Etonian, a Harrovian, a Wykehamist, a Rugbeian—each represents a certain type of character. My own experience of the great boarding schools has been principally drawn from two, but these are perhaps the greatest of them all—Eton and Harrow; in one I lived as a boy, in the other as a master; and as no other schools have done more, or perhaps so much, for the formation of the character exhibited now for several centuries by the statesmen, administrators, and reformers, the men of action and, although in less degree, the men of thought, who have created or dignified the Empire, you will forgive me if I derive my remarks, not indeed solely, but chiefly, from these two schools.

Between the universities, indeed, and the public schools, no comparison is possible. The universities enjoy an intellectual distinction to which the schools make no pretence. Oxford and Cambridge have been for centuries the homes of famous discoverers, scholars, and teachers, whose names are household words wherever learning is held in honour throughout the world. But it is not improbable that there is nobody in this room who can recall the name of any English schoolmaster, living or dead, unless it be that of Dr. Arnold, the headmaster of Rugby, whose portrait is drawn in the pages of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, or possibly that of Mr. Thring, the headmaster of Uppingham, who had the honour, I think, of educating his Excellency the British Ambassador, Sir Claude Macdonald. But upon the character

of English gentlemen the influence of the public schools seems to be even greater than that of the universities. There are several reasons why it should be so. Practically the whole governing class of Englishmen is educated in the public schools. But it is only a fraction of public school boys who matriculate at the universities. A boy spends four or five years; and those the most impressionable years of his life, from thirteen to eighteen or nineteen, at his public school. If he goes to the university, the years which he spends there are usually not more than three. Again, while he passes only half of each year as a resident at his university, the other half being vacation, when he may be, and generally is, away from college, he passes two-thirds of each year during his school life at his public school. Still more important is the fact that a boy at school is subject to a personal authority closer and stronger than any which he experiences in his university or his college.

Thus it is, probably, that Englishmen have in general felt a deeper affection for their schools than for their universities. I do not forget that a good many notable men, like Lord Macaulay, have been warmly attached throughout life to their colleges at Oxford or Cambridge. Such men have, often, not passed through public schools. But the history of the great English public schools is replete with instances of the affectionate and even passionate feeling shown by illustrious Englishmen for the places in which they had spent the golden days of boyhood. Gray's *Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College*; Byron's *Lines Written Beneath an Elm in the Churchyard at Harrow*, are known to all students of English literature. But will you let me cite what has always seemed to me the most beautiful example of patriotic devotion to a school? The Marquis Wellesley, the elder brother of the great Duke of Wellington, received his education at Eton. He became there almost the ideal of a scholar and a gentleman. After a life of noble service to the State in various offices, he attained that supreme position in the British Empire, the Governor-Generalship of India. But he never forgot his old school. From the banks of the Ganges he would correspond, upon points of classical learning, with his tutor at Eton. To serve Eton was the ambition—the inspiration—of his life. He prayed to be buried at Eton; and there, in the college chapel, he lies now at rest, and upon his monument are graven the exquisite Latin verses which he wrote for his own epitaph in the desire of expressing his sense of indebtedness to the school which had wrought its spell upon his life.

If, then, in this lecture I seem to dwell more upon the public schools than upon the universities, as formative influences in the character of an English gentleman, the reason is not only that I know them better and have spent a longer time in them; it is that I believe them to have played a larger historical part in making English gentlemen to be such as they are. But as touching the formation of character there is no broad difference between the universities and the

public schools ; they aim at the same end, and they seek to attain it by much the same means ; they are largely interdependent ; and the youth who passes from school to college, although he enters upon a liberty which has hitherto been strange to him, is conscious of no such moral shock as would necessarily occur if his new life were wholly alien from the old.

It is true, alike of a university and of a public school, that he who is admitted to one or the other becomes at once a member of a society. He does not stand alone. He occupies a position in which his actions affect others, and the actions of others affect him. He becomes participant, as others are, not only in the credit, but, if need be, in the misfortune or disgrace of the body to which he and they belong. So, too, his own conduct in turn affects that body. If he does well, his good deeds reflect honour upon his university or his school. But if he commits any flagrant violation of the moral law upon which the society depends, then his punishment is to be struck off the roll of membership, to be degraded or expelled, and to go out into the world as one who has proved himself unworthy of incorporation in a community of honourable gentlemen. There is a well-known story that Dr. Arnold, on an occasion when some gross evil had displayed itself at Rugby, and he had been compelled to send away several boys, exclaimed in the presence of all the school : ' It is *not* necessary that this should be a school of three hundred, or one hundred, or of fifty boys ; but it is necessary that it should be a school of Christian gentlemen.' By my own experience I know how keenly boys, and their parents too, feel the pain of their enforced removal from the society of a public school. Yes, and I know, too, what pains they will sometimes take in after life to regain the honourable position from which they have fallen in the eyes of the school.

As regards the training of an English gentleman, you will not, I think, feel surprise if I put as the first lesson to be learnt at a public school—obedience. The philosopher Aristotle remarked long ago that no one can be qualified to command but he who has already been taught to obey. To be equally capable of exercising authority and of submitting to it was the ancient Greek educational ideal. A good schoolmaster, like a wise parent, expects absolute, unhesitating obedience from the child. He issues his orders ; he does not, and in the nature of the case he cannot, explain his reasons. If he argues with his pupils, he is lost. I am not sure that this principle of action is good for the master. But beyond doubt it is good for the pupil. It inculcates that sovereign consciousness of duty which elevates public life. ' England expects '—or, as the better original word was, ' confides '—' that every man will do his duty,' was, as you know, Nelson's signal at Trafalgar. The English boy learns at school, the English undergraduate learns at college, that, when once the path of duty is seen to be plain, he must choose it unquestionably and

unhesitatingly, he must never shirk it, must never depart from it, but, at all costs, must follow it to the end: I do not say this lesson is not equally well taught elsewhere than in the public schools of England. It is a principle magnificently illustrated in the recent history of your own nation. I say only, that English gentlemen learn it, and learn it in the universities, and still more in the public schools.

Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die;
 Into the valley of Death
Rode the Six Hundred.

The first element in all noble character, and therefore in the character of an English gentleman, is obedience.

When a boy goes to school in England, he comes under the influence of his masters and also of his schoolfellows. It is this double influence which shapes his character. Nor is the same double influence wanting in the university; but there it is somewhat less powerful.

As a rule, it is characteristic of English education that, while a boy or a youth in his intellectual training passes freely from one teacher to another, from one lecturer to another, there is one person who is charged with his moral training throughout the whole period of his life at school or at college. That person is often, but not always, called a tutor. It is his business to study his pupil's idiosyncrasy, to watch and to guide him, to draw out what is best in him, and, if need be, to protect him against misunderstanding and punishment. The tutor in a public school enjoys a unique responsibility. He stands in relation to a boy's whole composite nature—to his body and mind and spirit. He looks after his physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual welfare. He is to him, or is supposed to be, all that a parent, when the boy is at home, may be and ought to be. No profession, perhaps, makes a larger demand upon tact or insight or sympathy; for there is no profession in which a good and virtuous man may do so much harm, by mere faults of judgment, as the educational.

The schoolmaster begins, as I have said, by exacting obedience. But he will never be a first-rate schoolmaster if he stops there. Not authority alone, but sympathy, is the secret of his success. He must study individual character. He must not treat all natures alike. He must know when to draw in the reins of discipline, and when to relax them. He must aim at winning not only the obedience but the loyalty of his pupils. And the great agent in the creation of a loyal temper is trust. To read boys' letters, to listen to their conversation, to practise what is called *espionage* upon their movements would in English eyes be an unpardonable offence. I have heard of a schoolmaster who was suspected—wrongly, I hope and believe—of trying to

watch his pupils at play through a telescope, but it was long before they forgave him. There is a curious unwritten code of honour determining the proper relation of masters and boys in the public schools. For example, a master must not question one boy about others, nor must he question a boy about himself, or, if he asks a boy whether he has done a thing or not, he must not punish him for doing it; he must not (unless in certain extreme instances) use the evidence of servants against boys; for all such behaviour would undermine confidence. He must be just; boys will pardon rudeness and harshness, but never injustice; a master may be a 'beast,' as was said of one of the most famous of English schoolmasters, and if he is 'a just beast' he will be honoured and admired; but let him once make favourites, let him treat one boy with greater partiality than others, and he will never win—he will never deserve to win—respect. Above all, he must accept a boy's word. If a boy says that a thing is so, it is so; the master unhesitatingly believes him. It is better, far better, that a boy, who is base enough to tell a lie, should now and then escape punishment than that there should be an atmosphere of distrust between master and boys. The public opinion of a school emphatically condemns the boy who tells a lie. It responds at once to a master's generous trust in a boy's word. Dean Stanley, the biographer of Dr. Arnold, relates how he would stop boys from trying to prove the truth of their words, telling them, 'If you say so, that is quite enough—*of course* I believe your word;' and he adds, 'There grew up in consequence a general feeling that "it was a shame to tell Arnold a lie—he always believes one."'

It is impossible to overrate the moral value of the assumption, freely and not unreasonably made in the public schools, that an English gentleman will never tell a lie. If 'the word of an Englishman' possesses, as I think it does (and long may it possess!), a signal value all the world over, if it is readily trusted, just because the speaker is an Englishman, by the various races of mankind within and beyond the limits of the British Empire, the honour attaching to that word is in some sense the product of the education which Englishmen receive in their public schools and universities.

I have said that a master must be just. Justice is the quality most highly admired by boys in masters. English boys are strangely indignant at any real or supposed injustice which is done to them. But when they are justly treated, then, if they do wrong and are found out by legitimate means in doing it, they not only consent but expect to be punished. It is probably known to you that in the public schools the punishment is sometimes corporal. I do not defend such punishment; neither do I deprecate it. It is a recognised part of English education. To English thought the humiliation seems to lie not in the punishment, but in the wrong-doing which deserves it. Perhaps one who has inflicted this kind of punishment

as often as I have is not altogether an unprejudiced judge of it. But about corporal punishment in England, two curious facts lie beyond dispute. One is that, while the working class and the lower middle class dislike and resent it, and will not in general allow their children to undergo it, the aristocracy tolerate it without complaint. The time is coming, one might assert paradoxically, when it will be impossible to flog anybody but the son of a peer. And the other fact is that public school boys have often felt a special affection for the masters who have punished them most. In Westminster Abbey stand side by side the tombs of a master and his pupil. The master was Dr. Busby, who was headmaster of Westminster School for so long a time as fifty-eight years. Nobody ever flogged so many boys as he. The pupil was the theologian, Dr. South. It is told—I am not sure the story is true—that, when South came as a small boy to Westminster, Busby greeted him with the ominous words: ‘I see great talents in that sulky little boy, and my rod shall bring them out.’ If so, he was no doubt as good as his word. But when South lay upon his deathbed, it was his last prayer to be buried at his old master’s feet; and the master and the pupil now rest side by side.

I have been trying to show you how an English educator seeks to affect the lives and the characters of his pupils. He may make many mistakes. But in intention he aims at the two noblest ends which can be anywhere or at any time proposed to human effort—the encouragement of virtue, and the diffusion of knowledge. His influence is largely personal. It is what he is, rather than what he teaches, that tells upon the young. Such as he is, they naturally tend to be. But the object of his whole teaching and his whole example, whether at school or in the university, is to make them feel that they are members of a great society, and that a society constituted upon an indissoluble moral basis; in a word, it is to impress upon them the dignity of learning, but the yet higher dignity of character.

But it is probable that, in the formation of character, a boy’s schoolfellows exercise a stronger influence than any teachers; for they create the public opinion which is, as it were, the atmosphere of his life, and public opinion is the greatest force in the world of school. The rules which boys make for each other, even in matters so unimportant as dress, are often more stringent than any rules which masters make for them. One of the greatest difficulties in the education of the young is to inculcate an originality which will not be afraid to depart from the conventional standard of right and wrong. Originality is not always good, nor is convention necessarily bad; but without originality there can be no progress.

Public opinion, as it exists among the youth of England in schools and colleges, is not, indeed, free from curious eccentricities

or limitations ; but upon the whole it is sound, and it is strong. At all events, it sustains the ideal to which English gentlemen aspire.

If an English schoolboy could be asked what is the moral quality which he appreciates most highly, whether in masters or boys, he would probably answer that while in masters it is justice (as I have already suggested), in boys it is courage. English boys admire one who is brave. But it is physical courage which chiefly evokes their admiration. They hold that a young Englishman should do his duty gallantly, however unwelcome it may be, should bear pain unflinchingly, should volunteer for difficult and dangerous service, and should face the hardships of life with a smile. They are impatient, nay, contemptuous of the signs of emotion, especially of tears. They honour 'pluck,' as it is called. Such a story as that Nelson in his boyhood said, 'What is fear? I never saw fear,' inspires their enthusiasm. They hate cowardice—i.e. physical cowardice. I wish it were possible to say that they equally hate what Milton calls 'the cowardice of doing wrong.'

Then there is among English boys, and not less among young Englishmen generally, a binding sense of honour. 'Honour' is a word which comes home to English hearts. Sometimes when I have been upon my travels I have inquired if the Oriental languages possessed an equivalent word for 'honour.' Your own word *Bushido* comes nearest to it. It would not become me, as a stranger in Japan, to examine the precise moral significance of a word so delicate as *Bushido*. But the English 'honour' implies, among other things, that a person must speak the truth, that he must not take advantage of his neighbour's ignorance or weakness, that he must think less of himself than of his cause, and that he must avoid, as if it were a stain upon his shield, whatever is or tends to be mean, low, shabby, or ungentlemanly. In nothing perhaps is the character of a gentleman more strikingly seen than in his sensitive shrinking from a breach of trust. You will not mind my referring again to the illustrious name of Nelson. When he was a boy his father sent him on horseback to school at some distance from his home, telling him and his brother, as there was deep snow upon the ground, that he would leave it to their honour to go on or come back. The road was difficult and dangerous, but Nelson refused to turn back. 'We must go on,' he said. 'Remember, brother, it was left to our honour.'

A man's sense of honour, the consciousness of his obligation to do all and more than all that can be rightly expected of him, is a conspicuous feature in noble English character. It is the distinguishing mark of a gentleman. To violate it is, in common parlance, 'bad form.'

You will not think I claim this feature for my countrymen alone. It may be as prominent in Japan as in Great Britain. All I say is, that without the absolute personal trustworthiness, without the chivalrous code of honour which raises acts of grace or courtesy into

duties, no people nor any individual can attain the supreme beauty and dignity of the moral life.

The universities and the public schools render yet another service to the nation by fostering a broad sympathetic spirit among different classes. They are the most democratic places in the world; they are almost wholly free from snobbishness. In them a youth is taken for what he is worth in himself, without regard to rank, or wealth, or antecedents. The spirit prevailing in them is liberal and tolerant. Nor is it possible that boys or men, differing in social position or political sympathy or religious opinion, should be educated side by side in the same school and boarding-house, or in the same college, without learning something of the conciliation, the 'give and take,' the spirit of compromise, the disposition to look for points of agreement amidst divergences, which are among the best features of English public life. For a salutary lesson, such as the young need ever to learn, as it touches one side of gentlemanly conduct, is how to get on, not only with those with whom one agrees, but with those from whom one differs; and the universities and public schools, by their catholic spirit, emphasise that lesson.

There is something more. Not tolerance only, but generosity, is an attribute of high character. The young are naturally generous. They are free from malice and rancour. They take pleasure in each other's successes; even the vanquished can freely congratulate the victors. Time was when the public schools were defaced by cruelty, as *Tom Brown's Schooldays* shows. But they are changed, or are fast changing. In my thirteen years at Harrow, I was never once called upon to deal with a serious case of bullying. Towards physical infirmity, if it be nobly borne, boys are sympathetic. They appreciate the high temper which bravely fights against difficulties. Weakness, especially in womanhood, constitutes an irresistible claim upon their help. The age of chivalry is not dead. The appeal to the generous instincts of youth never fails.

It may be that the character of a gentleman is not often seen in its perfection. So Thackeray says; but he recognises what it is. 'Which of us can point out many such in his circle—men whose aims are generous, whose truth is constant, and not only constant in its kind, but elevated in its degree; whose want of meanness makes them simple; who can look the world honestly in the face, with an equal manly sympathy for the great and the small?'

At all events, to produce the character of a gentleman is the object set before the universities and public schools in England. Nor can that character wholly fail, where courage, honour, and a tolerant and generous spirit are freely preached and not infrequently displayed.

The influence of boys upon other boys is great, as I have said, but never is it so great as when the older and higher boys are

entrusted with a disciplinary power over their schoolfellows. Such boys are known as prefects, or præpostors, or monitors. They are few in number (perhaps a dozen or twenty at the most in a school of six hundred boys), but they are the intellectual and moral *élite* of the school. They enjoy certain privileges, and in return for them they are held to be largely responsible for the good order and the good conduct of the junior boys. They render a service of conspicuous value. For where trustfulness is the law of school life, there must be wrong incidents which a master does not and cannot know, and which it is better that he should not know; but the boys know them, and if they are disposed and empowered to put them down, their authority is more potent than his. My experience has shown me that, where a healthy confidential relation exists between a master and his leading boys, he need not fear the prevalence—I do not mean that he can feel safe against the occasional existence—of the most dangerous moral evils in a school. It is clear, too, that the prefectorial, or præpostorial, or monitorial system (call it by what name one may), through the delicate relation in which the leading boys stand alike to their masters and to their schoolfellows, is peculiarly fitted to prepare them for the honourable exercise of the governing function in manhood.

The life of a university or of a public school naturally divides itself into two parts; it comprises the hours of instruction and the hours of recreation, or, in other words, lessons and games. You will not, I hope, suspect me of forgetting the superior dignity which intrinsically attaches to the cultivation of the mind over any possible graces of the body. Upon this superiority it is the educator's duty to dwell in season and out of season. But I am speaking of the character of a gentleman; and when the athletic games of English youth are considered in their reference not to physical energy but to moral worth, it would seem that they possess an even higher value than intellectual studies. For learning, however excellent in itself, does not afford much necessary scope for such virtues as promptitude, resource, honour, co-operation, and unselfishness; but these are the soul of English games.

Of the intellectual education given in the universities and public schools I need perhaps say no more than that it is mainly linguistic and scientific. To either part of it a proper value belongs. In the study of science—if, indeed, science be taken to mean not only the so-called natural sciences, or the investigation of the properties and resources of the physical world, but, as it strictly should mean, all forms of exact observation and reflection—the young mind is taught to appreciate the nature of truth, to distinguish fact from theory, and to realise—as is, indeed, the primary condition of knowledge—what can and what cannot be said to be proved. But the fault of exact science as an educational instrument is that it is exact; it largely

deals with certainties rather than probabilities, it can establish its results beyond dispute. And this is true of mathematics pre-eminently, but in a less degree of all the experimental sciences. But human life is not made up of certainties. Such questions as arise in it can seldom, if ever, be settled absolutely; they demand the balance of opposing considerations, and if the balance upon the whole inclines one way, it might easily, in the majority of cases, incline the other. The reason why language is perhaps the supreme instrument of culture, why it disciplines the mind, as nothing else can, for the purposes of life, is that, as being itself a human product, it offers problems which are not absolutely determinable, but evoke and exercise the same balanced judgment as is needed in the daily affairs of life.

But both elements, the linguistic and the scientific, find a natural place in education; both tend to the strengthening and quickening of the mental faculties; and the best educator is he who makes the truest proportionate use of them. And if, apart from the actual training of the intellect, he can stamp upon his pupils' hearts the deep conviction that it is the attainment or even the pursuit, and not the reward, of knowledge which is man's true glory, if he can bring home to them the immensity of the triumphs which have been won for all mankind by the humble, patient, self-sacrificing labours of a number of devoted students, who have loved truth as a pearl of great price, and in the search for it have gladly borne neglect, reproach, contumely, persecution, and even death, he will send them out into the world with a largeness of view and a breadth of sympathy which are the attributes, as they are the guarantees, of noble character.

But it is here, I think, that in the training of an English gentleman, whether at school or at college, the games are more important than the studies. You will understand that I speak of the games, not as physical exercises, but as moral disciplines. At all events, there is in English education nothing on the intellectual side which distinguishes it from the education of other Western countries; but on the athletic side there is something that is unique.

It has often struck me that the English language is a witness of the interest and importance attaching to sport or sports in English life; for the language is full of phrases and figures drawn from games. I do not know how far foreigners, in learning the English language, appreciate them; but the following will serve as illustrations.

To 'play up,' to 'play the game,' to 'play an uphill game,' to 'pull together,' to 'play with a straight bat,' to 'follow up,' to 'be in at the death,' 'fair play,' 'foul play,' 'a sportsmanlike spirit,' 'the game is never lost till it is won'—these and a score of other expressions which might be quoted are freely taken from the games and sports of English life.

It would ill become me to decide how far the interest in games, which is common in England, extends to Japan. Since I have been

here, I have watched a game of football, or something like a game of football, being played in one of your public parks. And when I was in India it occurred to me more than once that the throng of natives who would look on at a game of cricket, and still more of football, in the Maidan at Calcutta, whether the players were Englishmen or Indians, held out the hope of a new bond of sympathy between the governing class and the governed in the Indian Empire.

Let me try to indicate some of the lessons which the youth of England learn from their games ; for not in the public schools only, but in the universities, the games, and especially cricket, football, and rowing, excite much interest—more, it is sometimes thought, than is suitable to places of education.

Among these lessons the first is fairness. So essential is it, that in public life if a person does what is not altogether straight or upright, he is said 'not to play the game.' For to games a gentlemanly spirit is essential. No game can be properly played if the players condescend to sharp practice, if they take advantage one of another, if they condescend to underhand tricks, or even if they insist upon the letter, as against the spirit, of the rules under which the game is played. Cheating at cards is said to be the one offence which is never pardoned in English society. But in all games unfairness is unpardonable. It is destructive of the confidence upon which games depend. It is fatal to honourable sport. And the absolute fairness required of the players in games is equally requisite in the umpires. They, too, must be above suspicion. It must not enter into the heads of the friendly antagonists who compete for victory in the games that an umpire could ever give a decision which is not strictly conscientious, or that his decision, when it is given, is open to dispute. The implicit obedience to the umpire in games is not the least salutary lesson which boys and young men learn by playing them. It prepares them for the obedience which they must yield in after life to the umpires who preside over great assemblies, and notably to the Speaker of the House of Commons. There is some reason, it is said, to fear that members of the House of Commons are in danger of forgetting the spirit of fair play ; I do not indeed know that it is so ; but I do know that as little as cricket or football can the game of politics be properly played, if the honourable temper characteristic of it is wanting. It is impossible to frame such rules as will prevent persons who are not gentlemen from doing ungentlemanly things. But if public men in England should ever need to be taught again what is the true temper of conducting affairs both public and private, they may learn it from the games as played, where it is customary to play them with the smallest alloy of cheating or gambling, in the public schools and universities. That temper has lately been called by a distinguished athlete, Mr. C. B. Fry, the English *Bushido*. I do not doubt—nay, I know—that you in Japan appreciate and exemplify it. You have

acquired it by other—perhaps better—means than we have. But Englishmen, to whom it is as the breath of their nostrils, have to a great extent discovered its secret and its value through their games.

May I not add, ere I leave this part of my subject, that, if there is one lesson which the world needs to learn, and for all I know may learn fully or partly in the present century, it is how great the blessing would be if civilised nations would come to treat each other with the candour, the good faith, the generous confidence with which gentlemen treat each other in private life?

Again, the games which Englishmen play are schools of nerve. It is not perhaps necessary to assure you that my countrymen, in spite of their many acknowledged virtues, which I am not likely to deny or to depreciate, are not the most modest race in the world. They tell you that 'Englishmen never know when they are beaten,' as though no other race had ever stood up against heavy odds. In the light of recent events you may surely dispute the palm of valour with any nation. Yet games serve a useful purpose in England, as training the nerves. Young Englishmen are taught in them not to lose head or heart. It has often been a pleasure to me to see how boys of seventeen or eighteen years or even younger, who had lived lives far away from the glare of publicity, would take their places with quiet modesty to represent the school at cricket before a crowd numbering fifteen or twenty thousand people, and would then go back, as if it were the most natural thing in the world, to their old simple obscure routine of scholastic duties. The spirit which 'plays an uphill game' to the last, and sometimes 'pulls the match out of the fire,' as the phrase is, in circumstances apparently hopeless, is a splendid feature of character. There are thrilling moments in games—moments when everything turns upon the resolution of one player—and there are such moments in war, or politics, or human life. It may well be hoped that he who has not failed in the one will not fail in the others; for the power of quick decision is one of the greatest human acquirements. According to my experience of life, it is often more important that a decision should be made than that the decision so made should be the best possible. 'Opportunity,' as the proverb says, 'is bald at the back of her head.' To seize the fleeting opportunity when it comes, and to make the best use of it, is a lesson of high value in life. For lost chances seldom recur; and mistakes, even single mistakes, are hard, and perhaps impossible, to retrieve, as in life, so also in games. It is thus too that games are a useful discipline for life.

But there are other and still higher lessons to be learnt in games. The spirit of subordination and co-operation, the complete authority, the ready obedience, the self-respect and self-sacrifice of the playing-field enter largely into life. If a boy will yield up his coveted place in the Eleven to one whom he recognises as a better player than

himself, or if he will throw away the chance of personal distinction in order that another may distinguish himself, if he shows modesty in success or fortitude in defeat—has he not learnt something which will help him to be a nobler citizen? There is no cricketer worthy of the name, be he boy or man, who does not think more of the Eleven than of himself, and who would not be glad to sacrifice himself if he could so win the victory for his side. Nay, the true sportsman, the true gentleman, will be careful, at whatever cost, to let others have the credit rather than himself. He will, if need be, take the second place, and not the first, as that noble English soldier, Sir James Outram, did in the Indian Mutiny, when he generously surrendered to his junior officer, Sir Henry Havelock, the honour of relieving Lucknow, and himself served in a civil capacity under him.

All these are qualities, and others like them, tending to produce what I may perhaps claim as a characteristic of the British race—the power of government; for it is a quality which the race has exhibited in relation to subject peoples at many periods of English history in the many regions of the world where the flag of England flies. From India alone it were possible to draw a hundred instances. Englishmen in India have not perhaps won the affection of the native population. They have been trusted, but they have not always been liked. Yet they have evinced a high administrative capacity. There are parts of India where two or three Englishmen by their mere presence maintain order through vast tracts of country. Their rule is as beneficial as it is efficacious. I remember visiting a part of Rajpootana where one official—a youth whose years cannot much have exceeded twenty-five—was administering famine relief single-handed to a million of starving people; his superiors had died or were invalided, and he stood alone face to face with such a task. But he did not falter, he did not fail, he saved the people from death.

If my country owes a peculiar debt of gratitude to any of her sons, it is to those officials, whether military or civil, who in far parts of the world have, often in spite of neglect, and sometimes of discouragement, sustained the honour of the Empire. I do not think I say too much if I profess that one who has received the education of an English gentleman will not wholly fail, however tight the place may be in which he finds himself, however serious the difficulties to be overcome. When he is put down in the face of duty, he will not lose heart or head, he will know what to do, and he will do it. It is this reserve power lying hidden in the British race which is, I think, the hope of the Empire.

But let me come back once more to the universities and the public schools.

There is a certain sympathy, not the less influential because indefinable, a sort of Freemasonry (if I may use a telling English expression) among all the members of the same school or college, or

even the same university. To have been educated at Oxford or Cambridge, and still more at Eton or Harrow, is a bond of union with all who have been educated there. All the world over, Oxford and Cambridge men, Etonians and Harrovians, are knit together by strong and sacred memories. It has been my fortune in various distant parts of the world to attend dinners and meetings connected with the public schools of which I am a member; and if ever a man living far from home finds himself in difficult circumstances, he may turn for sympathy and help, with an almost certain hope of receiving it, to men to whom he can address an appeal in the name of their common *Alma Mater*.

It has sometimes happened that the old association of school or college has been a strength to Englishmen charged with an onerous and even perilous responsibility. Not many years ago, in the most troublous days of Ireland, that unfortunate country which seems to be at once nearest to and farthest from the heart of the British Empire, the three men who were called to bear the chief burden of Irish administration had all been schoolfellows at Harrow. In still more recent days, the Viceroy, or Governor-General, of India, and the Governors of Bombay and Madras, were men who had all received their education, not only in the same school, but, I think, at the same time in the same house at Eton.

Can it be wrong for me, then, at this point, to insist upon the friendships of school and college as forming not only a charm no less enduring than delightful in the personal life, but a strong element in the elevation of character? Nobody who has spent a part of his life at school or college will fail to appreciate afterwards what he owes to noble friendships there begun. He will know something at least of the admiring gratitude which led a distinguished Englishman long ago to desire that he might be simply described in his epitaph as having been 'the friend of Sir Philip Sidney.'

It is difficult for me, in addressing any but a British audience, to express in adequate words how the varied associations of school life tend to create what I can only call a feeling of School patriotism. The thought of the school becomes an inspiring motive in life. As the descendant of a noble family, so the member of a famous school is lifted above himself by his inherited associations. He shrinks from all that is lowering, he aspires to all that is honest and of good report, for the sake of the school which he loves. It is well then that in the public schools, and to some extent also in the colleges at the universities, the sense of historical continuity should be constantly brought before the minds of the young. There is perhaps an annual commemoration of benefactors. Eminent members of the school, when they come back to the place of their education, are welcomed with signal honour. When one of them attains a high distinction, a holiday is granted to his successors in the school. When one of them passes to his rest,

his memory is honoured by the tolling of the school bell or by some reference to his life in the chapel or the speech-room.

Let me illustrate this obligation of nobility—this ennobling influence of school-life upon Englishmen—by reference to one of those songs which, in not a few schools, but pre-eminently at Harrow, have been written and set to music, to serve like national airs in inspiring or quickening lofty sentiments. At Harrow, when the boys are called over, each of them as he passes the master signifies his presence by the simple words, 'Here, sir.' One of my late colleagues, a richly gifted master, who is now lost to the school, has chosen these words as the motto of a song in which the boys are taught that, whenever duty calls them, be it to effort, or suffering, or even to death, they must not flinch, but must meet it, gladly and cheerfully, with the familiar words of their school-life, 'Here, sir,' on their lips. It was in such a spirit as this that the young Etonian soldier at Laing's Nek in Natal, breathing the prayer *Floreat Etona*, 'May Eton flourish!' laid down his life.

And now I can bring this lengthy lecture to an end.

Education, whether in Great Britain or in Japan, is all preparatory to after-life. The test of an educational system is not what the pupils are, or how they acquit themselves at fifteen or nineteen or twenty-two or twenty-five years of age, but how they behave as men in private and public affairs. So to discipline them that they may do well in the battle of life is the end of all teaching. Apart, then, from the general linguistic and scientific curriculum of the schools and universities there are various subjects, such as the history of the nation, the growth of the Empire, the worth of imperial sentiment, the relation of labour and capital, the sense of public duty, and even the art of public speaking, which are or ought to be studied by all Englishmen. In late years there has been an effort to quicken the sense of civic duty by familiarising the young in some degree with the aspects of practical philanthropy. Many public schools and colleges have instituted missions—i.e. centres of philanthropic and spiritual activity—in crowded cities. On Harrow Hill a memorial tablet reminds successive generations of boys that at the particular spot where it is placed a great Harrovian, the Earl of Shaftesbury, when he had but recently ceased to be a Harrow boy, conceived the idea of devoting his life to the amelioration of the conditions under which the working classes lived and laboured. And so it becomes natural to remark, although I can only just suggest before this audience, that the life of English youth, whether in colleges or in schools, is constantly hallowed by religion. The chapel is the soul of the life. There the boys in a public school meet regularly for worship; there they listen to words of encouragement and exhortation from the masters, from the head-master especially; there they look upon the memorials of their school-fellows who, in the long history of the school, have done noble service,

and perhaps have laid down their lives for their country. For all English education is actuated by the Spirit of Him of whom an ancient English poet has said, that He was

The first true gentleman that ever breathed.

So I have tried to give you a sketch of English education, if only on one of its sides. Great Britain and Japan have many things in common. There have been points of resemblance in their history. There will be yet other such points, if I mistake not, in their destiny. Some of the problems which we have partly solved still await their solution here. I hope you will approach them in the spirit of that imitative originality which chooses the good and leaves what is faulty and wrong. It is a happy fortune in the world to be associated with institutions which are either very old or very new. The civilised world to-day looks with admiration on your achievements. It dreams your dreams with you. For my part, I cannot but cherish the confident hope that the alliance between your country and mine will tend more and more to that end which seems to be the ultimate goal of human history—viz. the intellectual, moral, and at last the spiritual fusion of the races of the East and of the West.

J. E. C. WELLDON.

IS 'JOB' A PROBLEM PLAY?

No book in the Canon of Scripture has caused such perplexity, or given to commentators such material for the expression of different explanatory conjectures, as that of 'Job.' It has been defined as a chronicle of fact, a didactic theme, an allegory, an idyl, a speculative treatise on theology, and a dramatic poem. No sooner does the writer agree on his description, than he begins conscientiously to grapple with the difficulties his definition has called into being, and it is generally admitted that we have no satisfactory explanation of 'Job,' and nothing which comes within measurable distance of it.

Yet, underlying all the ripe scholarship which has been brought to bear on this subject, there is always the hint of what appears to me to be the one solution, which I have ventured to put forward in this article. Unfortunately, every critic of the Bible, unless he wishes to be placed outside the pale of orthodoxy and face general discredit, has to saddle himself with a partner in his work of exegesis, and that partner is the Church or sect to which he belongs, or rather a number of very good, very pious, but very prejudiced members of it. Bible students, therefore, cannot approach the study of the sacred writings with the same open mind with which they approach the literature of any other country. The influence of the partner is at once felt, for there is certain business he will not touch, or allow to be touched.

With this in mind, it is not altogether surprising that we possess nothing in the way of a history of Hebrew drama. Jewish poetry, music, law, architecture have their exponents, but this particular form of literature is left severely alone, so much so that the prevalent idea is that there is no drama to write about. The stage, early in Church history, came into bad repute. Among severely religious people it is in the position of a poor relative who has compromised himself, and the name must not be mentioned in the family.

Yet the drama is all there, waiting for the man who has the time and the courage to give us the book that shall treat of it thoroughly. To suppose that the Jews produced no dramatic literature is, to say the least, an improbable assumption. In the face of facts it is an impossible one. In individuals, as in nations, drama, in some

form or another, is bound to emerge and assert itself, because it is woven into the fabric of our being. Life is drama, and drama is life. Sooner or later the rough facts of things will be seized and lifted by the method of dramatic writing. I do not assert, of course, that in the Bible we have the fulness and peculiar richness of the Athenian theatre, but we have exactly what we have in the early history of Greece, the dramatic element slowly encroaching upon the lyric and epic form, until we have the tragedy of 'Job' and the musical pastoral comedy of 'The Songs of Solomon.'

The higher critics are, generally speaking, agreed as to the date of 'Job,' at all events within a few years. We know, from other sources than Biblical, that it was the age when drama was a spiritual and intellectual force rather than a diversion for jaded and overworked humanity. It was the method for purifying and raising the emotions, and of eliminating the hysterical from life, the channel through which the best thought of the day was communicated to the masses. The theatre in Greece was the arena where matters of religion and philosophy that had got beyond the accepted beliefs, and contradicted received ideas of Divine government, were freely discussed. That is precisely the scheme underlying 'Job,' if we reject the epilogue. The best authorities regard it as spurious. It is an addition and a concession to modern times, and sprang from a desire to make the drama end happily. The dramatic ideal is sacrificed either to popular demand or because the later writer wished to exploit his own views of Divine justice. It shows a terrible falling away from the grandeur of 'Job,' which ends in a tragedy with the words :

I repent in dust and ashes.

And we might say with Shakespeare :

The rest is silence.

The sacred text has it:

The words of Job are ended.

Now we have passed some way on the road to a solution of a problem when we have stated in precise terms the nature and definition of its conditions. By drama, to put it briefly, I mean the conflict of opposing forces. The work of the dramatist is to bring together characters representing divergent aims and tendencies, and to exhibit them in actual collision, in what we call a scene. There must be a unity of purpose in the story, and this must be led up to and elaborated by the dialogue. There must be entanglement and disentanglement, or the resolution of the plot, as it is generally called. A play, for stage purposes, must admit of intelligent people taking the book, associating themselves with the characters, and, by speaking the lines in the order written, telling the complete story. There must be

hints in the way of characterisation, which give the actor an insight into the character he is about to interpret, and the drama must proceed towards *crescendo* until the climax is reached. Pathos, humour, comedy, irony, invective must accompany the development of a plot in a way that will grip the audience by sharp contrast.

Does the Book of Job fulfil these conditions? If so, it is a drama, and by the number of these conditions it complies with, it takes its definite place in dramatic literature, and gives us some idea of its date.

Now let us, with these conditions in mind, examine the purpose and construction of the Book of Job as we have it to-day, more or less complete. The unity of the story is concerned with a problem of human existence, and the problem to be attacked is, 'Why do the religious suffer?' The author opens his story with a device in common use among the early Greek dramatists. He gets to the problem to be exploited at once by means of narration; and, like Æschylus, he adopts the 'simple' as opposed to the 'complex' method of construction. The problem, the ultimate issue, and the mode by which it shall be brought about, are known to the audience from the start, and then, following exactly on Æschylus's lines, the action moves on in one unswerving and impressive channel, while the dialogue is marked by intense life, movement, and dramatic force. He adopts the well-known expedient of Æschylus in bringing his chief antagonists face to face and exposing them to view in the very net of contention, thus imparting to the various situations just such energy and strength as drama, for stage purposes, requires.

The prologue acquaints us with the chief character, Job, and the nature of his calamities. He is depicted as a prosperous Arab sheik, rich in cattle and other possessions, displaying a tender solicitude for the welfare of his family. The scene changes, and we are transported by the poet from the plains of Uz to the halls of heaven, where, like an Oriental sovereign, the Almighty holds His court. The 'sons of God'—i.e., the angels—'come from time to time to report themselves to their Sovereign.'¹ In this scene begins the actual staging of the story. The construction is so much in the nature of a play that half a dozen people, with the Bible in their hands, could represent it without any interference with the text. For modern stage purposes we should have :

SCENE : *The Court of Heaven, discovered the ALMIGHTY, angels presenting themselves before HIM. [Enter SATAN.]*

GOD. Whence comest thou ?

SATAN. From going to and fro in the earth, and walking up and down in it.

GOD. Hast thou considered my servant Job ? . . . For there is none like

¹ Vide Driver's Introduction to Job.

him in the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil.

SATAN. Doth Job fear God for nought? . . . Hast Thou not put a hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? Thou hast blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land. But put forth Thine hand now and touch all that he hath, and he will renounce Thee to Thy face.

GOD. Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand.

[Exit SATAN.]

Here we have a perfect scene, sublime in its simplicity. Change the names and we might be reading from a Greek play. There is an audacious originality in the author's conception of Satan. How it must have fascinated an audience to see the arch-fiend depicted as one of the sons of God, and sneering in the very face of the Almighty! How the dramatic strength is intensified by such audacity, and the knowledge that to the enemy of mankind is given, for the time being, almost unlimited power over a good man! This is the strong dramatic touch exactly of that character which grips a crowd of people. The atmosphere, in few words, is charged with the potentialities of tragedy.

A second time the celestial court is held, and the story is carried on by narrative, still keeping to legitimate dramatic construction. We have Satan, dissatisfied with his efforts, again, under dramatic conditions, receiving permission to afflict Job. In *Hamlet* Shakespeare sought to depict a great deed laid upon a gentle soul unequal to the strain of it. As Goethe puts it: 'An oak tree planted in a costly vase which should have received into its bosom only lovely flowers: the roots spread, but the vase is shivered to pieces.' Job is the Hamlet of the East. We have presented to us a pure, beautiful, idyllic nature, which sinks beneath a burden which it can neither bear nor throw off. Like Hamlet, he turns and winds and agonises, advances and recoils, as he argues out the problem. 'The hero has no plan, and yet the piece is full of plan.' We could easily imagine Job turning on his comforters, who insist that the unfortunate man alone is responsible for his calamities, and saying:

The time is out of joint: O cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right!

As a matter of fact Job says:

Let the day perish wherein I was born,
And the night which said, There is a man child conceived.
Let that day be darkness:
Let not God regard it from above.

And it might be Job who says:

O that this too too solid flesh would melt,
Thaw and resolve itself into a dew!
Or that the Everlasting had not fixed
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter.

And again we have the language, atmosphere, and sentiment of Job :

How weary, stale, flat and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world.—HAMLET.

It would have been interesting to have had Shakespeare's opinion on 'Job' as a drama. His opinion, I feel, would have been a dangerous venture in those days, but there is no doubt in my mind that he helped himself to what he wanted of 'Job' to build up the character and play of 'Hamlet.'

The author of 'Job,' with great daring, but with realistic and human touch, introduces a comedy scene into a situation of surpassing pathos. You have the hero staggering under successive blows, smitten with sore boils and in pitiable condition, and upon this scene come Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar. They come, too, with the proclaimed intention of comforting him. The first note of comfort they strike is to announce that he is so altered they do not recognise him. This would scarcely add anything of the nature comforting to Job in his state of mind. He meets this with silence, and very masterly indeed is that silence with which these men regard each other. One appreciates the tension of it all, and the situation is again solemn and impressive. But the master is a genius for light and shade. The men who come to comfort remain to argue that, after all, it is Job's own fault, and in so many words tell him that it serves him right. They are shocked at his language, and at once you are plunged into the debate, and here the author of the drama exploits to the full his problem: 'Why do the righteous suffer?'

The debate is symmetrically planned. We have first one and then another up against Job. All have been trained in a school which taught that afflictions are God's testimony for sin; but Job is conscious that he is not a sinner to the extent of meriting such punishments as have come upon him: hence you have a fine situation. He must hold to a belief which is impossible, or deny the justice of his Maker. Further, that God Who knows him to be innocent punishes him as if he were guilty, and is therefore regardless of justice in the cosmic ordering of things. The author gets his chance now to attack the accepted beliefs of his day, of advancing ideas that are outside popular theology, and he does so with a daring that proceeds on its way building up a strong story.

In the first cycle of speeches his friends occupied themselves with presenting what, we may take it, is the accepted theology of the day, God dispensing to every man according to his morals, not arbitrarily, but with mathematical accuracy, giving each man what he deserves. Therefore, Job in his suffering is the mark of Divine displeasure. What, then, has Job done? They urge him to confess. Job meets this with a denial, and protests his innocence. They imply bluntly

that he is a liar.² Here is the dramatist's art in perfection. The audience is admitted into the secret, the actors are not. Any stage-manager who knows anything about his art would say: 'This is good work; this is drama.' The situation is no mere house of cards. All the characters are strong, and the dialogue of each is to the point and vigorous. At the same time there are just those touches which one expects in a play.

The men are no mere puppets repeating speeches. You have real characters of flesh and blood, diverse and of different temperament. Eliphaz is most courteous and inclined to be conciliatory, while maintaining his own position. Bildad is arbitrary and accusing. Zophar is insinuating and provoking. Job is as some philosophic Titan who would scale the height where God is enthroned, and tear away the veil that conceals Him from mortal gaze. The characterisation is excellent, but it is the characterisation of public presentation. Again and again you get expressions which imply hot interruption which would be natural in spoken debate. 'Behold now.' 'Hear it and know it.' 'Be content. Look upon me.' Bildad complains of Job's long speeches—'How long wilt thou speak these things?'; and, again, 'Hold your peace; let me alone'; and 'Suffer me that I may speak.' 'Look straight at me! is it likely I shall lie to your face?' Chap. vi. 28.

Every now and then the high tide of eloquence is broken by some humorous or ironic allusion which only a dramatist would use, and use with the distinct object of providing fresh interest for his audience. Job asks: 'Am I a whale or a sea that thou settest a watch over me?' And there would be a ripple of laughter when Job remarks to his antagonists: 'No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom will die with you.' And an outburst of merriment when he adds, 'Miserable comforters are ye all.'

From general charges, Job's friends pass on to accuse him of definite sins, which, still arguing *a posteriori*, they are persuaded he must have committed: inhumanity, avarice, abuse of power, the ordinary faults of a wealthy Oriental. Job in reply still insists upon his innocence, but admits that he cannot solve the mystery of God's providence, and that his position is at variance with the belief of the age.

He appeals from the God of cruelty and injustice, whom in his madness he had imagined, to a God of truth and justice Who will vindicate him in heaven, whatever his earthly fate may be. But the gleam of light is transient.³ It is evident that the author here is throwing upon the argument all the force which the religious philosophy of the age can produce. Driver says it is difficult to find a logical place in Job's argument for chap. xxvii. vv. 12-13, where Job

² Notwithstanding my right,

I am accounted a liar. Chap. xxxiv. 6.

³ Driver.

apparently affirms what he has hitherto consistently denied—viz., that an evil fate does overtake the wicked. Looking at it as Dr. Driver does, the difficulty is insuperable; but if we regard it as a play acted before spectators there is no difficulty at all. In a desperate moment of frenzied despair he could say on a stage and in a play what would not be regarded as a logical sequence in cold narrative.

The same might be said of chapter xxviii., where we have Job's monologue on wisdom, meaning the full intellectual apprehension of the physical and moral order of the world, which he asserts, with convincing and pathetic force, is unattainable by man.

Dr. Gibson remarks (page 141), 'Beautiful and impressive as chap. xxviii. is, it is not easy to see its connection with the speech in which it occurs, or indeed with the poem as a whole.' Perhaps, indeed, if we had only to consider the relation of the chapter to what precedes it in the book, it might be supposed that Job, no longer irritated by the retorts of his friends, has reached a calmer mood; not abandoning the attempt to discover a speculative solution of the perplexities which distract him, finds man's wisdom to consist in the practical fulfilment of the duties of life. Still, as Davidson says (page xxxix.), such contentment, in the face of the problems of history, is very unlike the spirit shown elsewhere by Job; and it is doubtful whether the cessation of his friends' attacks would suffice psychologically to explain it. And an even greater difficulty arises in connection with what follows. If Job has risen to this tranquil temper, how comes it that he falls back (xxx. 20-23) into complainings, and dissatisfaction at not having been justified by God (xxxi. 35)? And, further, if he has reached, by the unaided force of his own meditations, this devout and submissive frame of mind, how is the ironical tone of the Divine speeches (chaps. xxxviii.-xlii. 6) to be accounted for? If he is already resigned to the inscrutability of the Divine ways, how does it need to be again pointed out to him? Or is it possible that the author conceives of Job's tranquil frame of mind as temporary only? There is, however, as just remarked, an imperfect psychological basis even for a temporary recovery of calmness: Job is unmoved by all the arguments of his friends; and no other independent influence, as in chaps. xxxviii.-xxxix., has been brought to bear upon him. The difficulty is very great. Either it seems the chapter, as several recent scholars have supposed, is an independent description of the character and value of wisdom, which does not really belong to the poem of Job; or, if it is an integral part of the poem, we must suppose that the author's psychology is not to be measured by the standard that would be applied to a Western poet; and that he represents Job, in this part of the book, as passing through moods of feeling without what, as judged by Western standards, would be deemed the necessary psychological motives.

Dr. Gibson's criticisms are what one would expect, when Job is treated merely as a poem or a narrative; but if the book be regarded as a play, then these difficulties immediately disappear. We recognise the dramatist's play of light and shade, and his psychological dissection of Job. Doubt and trust alternately chase each other through the mind of the afflicted man.* He hovers between heaven and hell—between darkness and light. It is one of those truly great scenes which stamp a work as a thing of genius. To relieve the tension we have here introduced Elihu, and Elihu presents so many difficulties to the commentators that most of them have agreed to regard the Elihu speeches as spurious, 'probably the addition of a later writer who wished to emphasise certain considerations to which he thought sufficient weight had not been attached by the other speakers.'⁴

'Job' regarded as a theological treatise, the character and speeches of Elihu are alike foreign to and destructive of the integrity of the book, and honesty of purpose compels the critics to throw it overboard. The introduction of such a character is not what the ordinary writer would do, but it is just what we would expect a dramatist to do. From his point of view all the characters are consistent, each an agent in unfolding the story, bringing his own distinct peculiarities of thought and feeling which give him a distinct personality. These character touches, which in an ordinary treatise would have been noted in a vague indistinct way, are here narrated with minuteness and with an accurate grip of temporary conditions.

Elihu is the man who would have rejoiced the heart of Socrates, as offering a target for his wit and rapier thrusts. His somewhat self-confident and boisterous manner of comporting himself differs entirely from the bearing of Job and his other antagonists. In Elihu we have manifestly a comedy character, who represents a distinct class of men and school of thought. He is your cock-sure religionist, who has leaped over the boundaries of all knowledge, and has come back to put people right. The Cosmic scheme presents no difficulties to him; everything is as simple as the making of an apple dumpling. He is so true to life that we feel we have met the man. The author of 'Job,' in the character of Elihu, is doing some hard hitting against prevalent methods of thought and argument. I am inclined to think that Elihu represents some self-satisfied theologian whom the author of 'Job' intended to exhibit and provoke ridicule.

Another important point to be considered here is the fact that the author causes Elihu to speak a more decidedly Aramæan dialect than the others. This is very up-to-date proficiency in the art of dramatic technique, which Dr. Davidson sees the force of, but dismisses it as scarcely probable in that early age. But everything had to have a beginning, and the same argument of improbability can be urged against any trick used for the first time. Elihu speaks a dialect

* Driver.

of Aramæan, just as Shakespeare occasionally makes a character talk something supposed to be Scotch. It would give a homely touch, and if Elihu be the representation of a real and possibly known character it would be a very realistic touch, but it is the touch of the dramatist. We recognise it again, too, in the professed modesty of his opening words, as compared with no small opinion of himself which he exhibits later. There is, too, something amusing about his introduction to this scene. He is, it would appear, a bystander who has nothing to do with the disputants, and the author gives him as an example of that particular class of people . . . 'who rush in where angels fear to tread.' Words flow from his eloquent mouth with all the captivating ardour of youth :

Mark well, O Job, hearken unto me :
Hold thy peace, and I will speak.
Hold thy peace, and I will teach thee wisdom.

This from a youth who professes modesty and respect for years is delightful, and in representation must have caused intense enjoyment to the audience.

In the midst of Elihu's bold eloquence, there is suddenly heard the murmur of the rising storm, and the first clap of thunder, and the man who is shouting,

I have yet to speak on God's behalf,

and claiming to be His representative in a special way, suddenly shows abject terror at the sound of what is held to be his Master's voice, and you have him saying,

my heart trembleth
And leapeth up out of its place.

How this would tickle the audience may well be imagined. We see the value of it from a stage point of view. In the sudden demoralisation of Elihu at this growl from the heavens, you have his gentle punishment for his officious interference.

So far, the problem has been debated without mercy or quarter, and the situation has been strongly held up. The resolution of the entanglement is not in sight. The audience get the first hint of it in the murmur of the rising storm. Their thoughts go back to the prologue, and they know the solution must come by means of Divine intervention. There is a delicacy of handling here which calls for special notice. In the prologue you have the Almighty speaking—among immortals to immortals. The author feels the difficulty of producing God upon a stage, so he causes the Divine voice to be heard from the midst of the storm. If 'Job' were merely a speculative treatise, or a story of rural and patriarchal religious life and thought, all these stage devices would be quite unnecessary.

The resolution of the drama is planned and executed with a large-

ness of design, a depth of purpose, a poetical imagery to which it would be difficult to find any parallel. Although from the opening we are expecting the *Deus ex machina*, yet when it does come it is unexpected, and the general effect is to impress the mind with a sense of unapproachable power and majesty. In a way the problem is never solved, and yet it is answered for all time. The question is lifted to a higher atmosphere, the equation is stated in other terms, the relative position of things is defined in an elevation of treatment profound and moving.

We have a series of searching questions which are addressed to Job, and to the hearts of all, actors and spectators alike. Each question is a blow of the master artist, driving his chisel into the raw marble which shall presently reveal the figure to be, and Job comes out of the ordeal changed, because he sees things in a new light. Each humiliating answer he gives marks his way of progress, removes the films from his eyes, and then we have passing before Job the 'panorama of creation exemplifying not only the wonders of inanimate nature, the earth, the sea, and the heavens, but also the astonishing variety of instincts and powers possessed by the animal creation.'⁵ The infinite resources of the Divine intelligence are flashed upon the mind of Job, and he is ironically invited to take God's place in the universe. Earlier in the drama Job expresses his desire to meet God in argument, the wish is granted,⁶ and we can only say what a scene for an actor! What a magnificent object lesson it must have been for the times!

Now as to the date of 'Job.' It must have been written in times which admitted of some speculation in matters theological. The first freethinker, I use the word in the Academic sense, was Solomon, so it must have been later than his day, and by someone who is well acquainted with the Poet-King's writings. That it was written by Moses must be dismissed. The man who said 'the sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation' made an *ex parte* statement which could not have come from the man who conceived the lofty conception of God as we have it in 'Job.' The dialogue is conceived in a spirit of what may be termed philosophic contradiction to the Mosaic view of things. The chief argument in favour of the older date is the setting of the story in patriarchal, pastoral times; but this very reason furnishes an additional argument that it was written as a play. The author naturally would place so daring a theme in an age and atmosphere different from present day, just as a modern writer might work out a problem with the men and women of, say, Stuart days. To attempt to fix a date by the setting is very much like judging the age of a picture by the frame. Dr. Driver fixes the date about 538 B.C. I venture to think it is even later, for the man who wrote 'Job' admits that he

⁵ Driver.

⁶ Chap. ix. 85; xxxi. 35; xlii. 22; xliii. 3-7.

gathered his illustrations and material from different corners of the world (chap. xii.) and various grades of society. The age of Solomon was a commercial one, and had opened up the West to the Hebrews. This eventually would bring them into touch with Greek literature. At all events, by 538 B.C. the Greek drama was fairly well established. Æschylus was born in 525 B.C., and it is quite possible that Æschylus drew from Job, or Job from Æschylus. The indications are many, but the construction of the sacred drama is more after the style of Sophocles. The art with which the author of the well-devised dialogue of 'Job' enhances the value of philosophic argument over a narrow assertion of dogma points to a later date than 538 B.C. If the reader will turn up his copy of the 'Electra' of Euripides he will find the identical construction that he finds in 'Job.' The two dramas open in precisely the same way. In the dialogue of Orestes you get such expressions.

ORESTES. Then let me urge my plea, and oh, forgive me,
If I seem tedious—grief is fond of words.

ELECTRA. Why should I tell thee what thine eyes behold ?

The characteristics of the dialogue suggestive of 'Job' are many, and so marked in their identity, one might be quoting from 'Job.'

In Æschylus it is the unrelenting power of fate, the justice of Providence, the effect of crime and wickedness that form the keynote of every scene, and the purpose of Æschylus is not, like that of other dramatists, to analyse the complex machinery of the human mind, but to reveal the relation in which men stand to the universal order of things, and to teach them how to read the mysterious decrees of destiny, and adjust their actions to the will of Providence.⁷

Omit 'Æschylus,' and insert 'Job,' and every word of this passage is true of the sacred writer. There is no doubt in my own mind that the author was acquainted with the work of the Greek dramatists, and that he was inspired by them to conceive his splendid problem in the form of drama.

In this opinion, I am pleased to say, I have the support of one bishop, though I only learnt it after the notes of this article were put together. But those who know the cold suspicion, and worse, to which a clergyman is subjected if he venture to think for himself, will appreciate the measure of comfort I derive from this episcopal support. True, my bishop has been dead nearly fifteen hundred years; but, fortunately for me, his opinion is preserved.

Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, who made a great name for himself in the Antiochean school of exegesis, appears to have been remarkable for his fearless handling of the Canon of Scripture. Certainly he gave a friendly lead to the higher critics of his day. He believed that Job was a real person, but he characterises the book as 'fiction written in imitation of the dramas of the heathen by an author

⁷ Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*.

familiar with the Greek wisdom.' The dialogue in the prologue, between God and Satan, Theodore regards as offensive. He is very much upset to find in the Septuagint version from which the bishop derived his knowledge of Job, that the patriarch had named his third daughter 'Horn of Amalthea.'* Such a name, he is sure, shows the author's love for heathen mythology, for what should an Idumean know of Jupiter, Juno, and the heathen gods? he asks. Dr. Cheyne fixes the date of Job about 500 B.C. However, the characterisation of Satan points to a later period, but the pursuit of indications of later date are not essential to this article.

The only thing wanting in this drama, and it shows the Hebrew deficiency, is the female character. A woman is introduced and she makes one remark, but a woman to be noticed in Jewish literature has to be altogether an extraordinary example of her sex. As a rule she ranked with the ox and the ass. In the tragedies of Æschylus, female characters, with the exception of Clytæmnestra, play an unimportant part. Dramas which seek to give a revelation of religious truth do not require passion as a motive. In 'Job,' certainly, the introduction of love would have taken attention from the grand theme the author sets out to exploit. Aristophanes in the 'Frogs,' taunts Æschylus with this omission, and remarks that he had 'little of the goddess of love in his composition.'

The objections which might be urged against the theory I am putting forward are trivial and unimportant. Is it not loosening the foundations of belief to assert that a book like 'Job' is an effort of imagination, rather than the narrative of facts? My reply is—Does it lessen the value of Christ's parables to know they are allegories, a method of teaching peculiar to the East? Why should a drama be considered an impossible channel for Divine precepts to reach the hearts and minds of men?

My attention has been called to the absence of stage resources in the way of scenery. One notices the same lack in the plays of Æschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles. The fact is, the early dramatists obtained their effects without scenery. They depended entirely upon the human voice, the action and dialogue, with, of course, the addition of music. The treatment of such lofty moral and religious themes required as little of the world as possible. The stage carpenter was not the man of importance that he is to-day, though the producer, in the real dramatic sense of the word, was. The author of 'Job,' like the Greek writers, endeavoured to inspire the mind rather than deceive the senses. The actual catastrophes take place off the stage, it will be noticed, and are reported by a messenger. We observe the same construction in Euripides.

Briefly, to sum up. The theory that 'Job' was written as a drama

* Job xlii. 13, 14, Keren-happuch. The Septuagint renders this *cornu copia*, horn of plenty.

is the natural explanation of a puzzle; and so admirably is it constructed that it could be put into rehearsals to-morrow without requiring a tithe of the 'touching up' given to plays by up-to-date writers. The actor-manager who has the ability and the courage to present 'Job,' who has sufficient of the religious instinct to get every ounce of strength out of 'Job's' glorious lines, for him there is awaiting a great artistic success, and, I venture to add, an eager and appreciative public.

FORBES PHILLIPS.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY AND MR. MARCONI

Nor many weeks since a grave statesman, with the care of a great British Colony on his shoulders; sat at a table in a modest cabin on an ocean liner, in mid-Atlantic, a thousand miles on his way from England to America. Before him was a small telegraphic instrument. He had begun life (and was proud of the fact) as a telegraph officer, and the old skill had not deserted him; but never had he expected to send messages from a rapidly moving ship. A few taps; and, as he rose, his two despatches were being deciphered in London, to be presently delivered. They were addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Postmaster-General, urging them forthwith to establish penny postage to the United States; and the sender was Sir Joseph Ward, Premier of New Zealand. Both the occasion and the matter of these communications seem to me noteworthy and interesting. Thanks to genius that has laboured patiently while we slept, every great ship is all through a voyage in full communication with the shore—the world is one vast whispering gallery.

OUR BULWARKS ON THE DEEP

A few months ago Mr. Balfour acknowledged that communication was maintained, by means of wireless telegraphy, between the Admiralty and each squadron and lonely cruiser on the 'waste of waters' from Plymouth to Gibraltar, Malta, Suez, and dotted over the stormy Atlantic. Every time the sun rises our isolated warships, invisible one from the other, exchange a cordial 'Good morning.' Mr. Wilson, in a recent account of naval warfare (happily only a wild romance), has impressively pictured the scene on the British flagship, leading England's hastily massed fleets to destroy an invading force, as 'strange' wireless messages come in from beyond the horizon betokening the unsuspecting foes' approach. By this potent influence the striking power of our admirals has been incalculably reinforced, and it becomes safe for an economic Government to take off two and a half millions from the Navy Estimates. I wonder if any dignified

official, or fervent orator, or gifted poet, will say a word of graceful acknowledgment to the retiring, secluded worker and inventor, whose existence is only manifested from time to time by some new and blinding flash of beneficent discovery !

THE 'ALIEN' OBJECTION

It is curious that a man so amiable, unobtrusive, and gentle as Mr. Marconi should excite such widespread jealousy and animosity. I say 'Mr.' Marconi. It is the custom of his rivals to emphasise his semi-Italian origin by describing him as 'Signor Guglielmo' Marconi, just as Napoleon's enemies always spelt his name 'Buonaparte.' We thankfully accept, however, the benefit of discoveries by Signori Galvani and Volta, without taunting them as compatriots of Cæsar, Dante, and Garibaldi. I do not dwell on the facts that his mother is an Irish lady, that he married an Irish lady, and that he speaks our language and loves our institutions like a native, though these considerations would go a long way in the United States. His claim to be regarded as one of us is based on the splendid scientific achievements which he has dedicated primarily to our service, achievements which would do honour to the purest patriot of our country.

GERMAN FEELING

American scientists dislike Mr. Marconi, not exactly because he has succeeded where they have failed, but because he is a 'foreigner.' German statesmen, on the other hand, fully admitting his success, object to him as being among the most dangerous of Englishmen. In a note intended to stir up the Washington Government against him, the German Minister writes : 'The efforts of the English Marconi Company to secure for its system of wireless telegraphy a world monopoly become apparent.' We all know that the German people are our very good friends ; and the Kaiser, as is natural, the best of all. But we also know that in connection with German commercial competition (to which we have no sort of objection, for the world is surely large enough for both) they are served by a Government trained in the Bismarckian school of diplomacy, preserving perhaps the forms of fair dealing, but essentially hostile to our commercial and maritime success and employing every legitimate means to compete with it. Some ten years ago the German Professor Slaby came over with high recommendations to see Mr. Marconi, as one scientist visits another. After spending a week in learning all that had been done and requesting to be kept informed of further improvements, he returned to Germany, and made arrangements with the Allgemeine Electricitäts Gesellschaft for a competing wireless agency company. The visit, however, was paid, and the company formed, too late.

The Marconi Company had practically covered the navigable world with its stations; every warship of importance in the British and Italian navies carried its instruments; sixteen shipping lines, including the North German Lloyd, adopted them; and the belated Gesellschaft had but one resource—to fall back on its Government.

A RING ROUND ENGLAND

The Wilhelm Strasse promptly rose to the occasion. In 1903 invitations were issued to a conference to be held in Berlin on wireless telegraphy. Notes were sent round alleging that England, through the Marconi Company, designed 'to obtain a monopoly in wireless telegraphy similar to that which she had of the cables, and calling upon foreign Powers to assist in overthrowing, or in preventing the establishment of this monopoly.' At the conference the German president 'urged that in the interest of the world's shipping there should be intercommunication between all systems of wireless telegraphy, that any "wireless" ship or coast station should be compelled to accept messages from any ship, irrespective of the wireless system employed.' Translated into plain English, this means 'that Marconi-rigged ships and stations should be compelled to accept messages from those Slaby rigged, irrespective of the fair start acquired at an immense expenditure of time, labour, and capital, by the Marconi Company.' In other words, it is proposed to annex British capital and property for the advantage of Germany. In October a second conference on this question is to assemble in Berlin, when most determined action may be expected on the part of Germany. One might allow for preliminary attempts to 'nobble' States with small maritime interests. But, as the Marconi system is the one adopted in the British Navy, one may sincerely trust that our own Government has not, as is alleged, a leaning towards tame surrender of the national interests.

This is the first time since the Congress of Vienna, in 1814, that a European council has been called to deal with one man. In 1814 the hunters were deliberating on the partition of the bear's skin, when a roar from escaped bruins scattered them. I do not like to compare John Bull to a bear; but he certainly would not quietly submit to be flayed alive. One is also reminded of the consultation at which the Lilliputians resolved to tie down the sleeping Gulliver with pack-threads; or of the infant giant Gargantua, who was tied in his cradle to prevent him from attending a banquet of his elders, at which nevertheless he appeared, to the amazement of the guests, carrying the cradle still bound to his back. Mr. Marconi is believed to have wonderful things in reserve, and it is by no means safe to regard him as an exhausted Leyden jar, which may be handled with impunity.

THE MAGICIAN

The formidable personage who has agitated all the Chancelleries is not yet thirty-three. He was born at Villa Griffone, near Bologna, in 1874, and was educated at Leghorn, under Professor Rosa, and at Bologna University, under Professor Righi. At the early age of four or five budding invention displayed itself, to the dismay of his mother, in the manufacture from wild berries of an excellent ink, so excellent that his white summer clothes were permanently 'marked,' for which feat he was scolded. In 1888 the late lamented Professor Heinrich Hertz demonstrated that a disruptive (spark) discharge of electricity causes electro-magnetic waves to radiate in all directions through the ether, exactly as waves radiate from the spot where a stone falls in still water. (The ether, I may remind unscientific readers, is a convention for the medium of transmission of energy, and is assumed to permeate all space and all matter.) The Hertzian waves travel with the same velocity as light, and would go eight times round the world in a second. With like rapidity the idea of utilising them for telegraphy darted through the minds of many students of electricity, among others young Marconi, men of world-wide fame like Oliver Lodge, Sir W. Preece, Professor Branly (inventor of the metallic filings tube afterwards named a coherer by Sir O. Lodge), Professor Langley, Professor Slaby, and others. But little progress was made. The problem was a double one, how to transmit energy to a distance, and how to devise a receiver sensitive enough to be affected by it; and the difficulties were largely of a mechanical character. The cable company shareholder, who had trembled at Hertz's discovery, smiled as year after year rolled by without practical application of it, and continued to draw his 15 per cent. dividend in peace. Sir W. Preece (one of the ablest scientists ever employed in the public service) succeeded, by means of an induced current (not the Hertzian wave) in telegraphing several miles without a connecting wire. So far back, indeed, as 1844 Professor Morse had telegraphed without wires under the Susquehanna River; and in 1854 that remarkable genius, the late James Bowman Lindsay, whom, like the Ayrshire Genius of Song, Scotland sadly neglected, patented an invention for telegraphing through water without wires. He actually sent a message two miles. It is pleasant to note that Mr. Marconi early made a pilgrimage to Dundee, in token of homage to this humble man of science, who had died before his brilliant successor was born. Now, in the eighties there was a popular Irish member, with the proportions of Falstaff, and the voice of Stentor. When at still midnight he stood in St. Stephen's portico, and roared 'Four Wheeler!' he was heard at a distance which it would have defied our experimenters in wireless telegraphy to cover. They had failed.

THE SOLUTION

Meanwhile Marconi had been working indefatigably, with one device after another, on his father's estate; and in 1895 he attained complete success, and at once patented his invention in Italy. Dr. Slaby says in his work: 'Marconi . . . has thus first shown how . . . telegraphy was possible.' In May 1896 the inventor came to England, and took out a patent (No. 12,039 of 1896); a similar patent being secured in the principal foreign countries. He introduced his system to the British Post Office through Sir W. Preece, Engineer-in-Chief of Telegraphs, who very handsomely admitted its merit, and even lectured upon it. In the first place Marconi, at the House of Commons, telegraphed across the Thames, 250 yards. In June 1897 he covered nine miles, in July twelve miles; in 1898 (to France) thirty-two miles; and finally in 1901, 3,000 miles. In 1898, during the confinement of the Prince of Wales (now King) to his yacht through an accident, communication was maintained between the Prince and his royal mother, at Osborne, by means of the Marconi apparatus. We can picture the venerable Sovereign, towards the close of a long reign that had witnessed so many vicissitudes and perils, due to the widely scattered nature of her dominions, conscious that she was bequeathing to her successor an Empire on the inconstant waves, one that hung, as in 1805, on the maintenance of communication with a distant admiral; we can picture her, I say, looking out on the sea for the first time without fearing it; with a full and grateful heart, and a kindly thought for the boyish inventor who had pointed the trident of Britannia with electric fire!

DEVELOPMENTS

Soon the Trinity House obtained an installation between the East Goodwin Lighthouse, which at once proved of practical value in preventing shipwrecks. The Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company, formed in 1897, signed agreements for the erection of coast stations with the Italian, Canadian, and Newfoundland Governments, and with Lloyd's (Lloyd's undertaking to adopt the Company's apparatus exclusively for fourteen years). Sixteen great shipping lines, including the North German Lloyd and Hamburg-America, use the system, and stations have been erected in suitable positions all over the world. All the fitted ships maintain a busy correspondence *en route*, with land and with each other; and one vessel sends and receives some 15,000 words between port and port. Some of them publish a daily paper, containing the latest news from shore. Financiers direct their businesses from mid-Atlantic; invalids send bulletins to anxious friends. There is now, by agreement with the Board of Trade, a set of installations in lightships round the coast; and the spectre of fog

no longer haunts the captain's bridge. The Post Office accepts wireless messages to and from any fitted ship. Helpless, disabled, driven into remote seas, the mariner feels that he is never out of reach of sympathy and aid.

RIVALRIES

We now reach the thorniest section of our survey. As might have been expected, it was not long before rival inventors began to patent competing systems, some of which are undoubtedly workable and efficient. By the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1904, the Post Office controls the establishment of stations, for which its licence must be obtained. There are four serious competitors with the Marconi Company—namely, the German Telefunken Company, using the Braun-Siemens and Slaby-Arco inventions; the American National Electric Signalling Company, operating the Fessenden system; the American De Forest Company; and the British Lodge-Muirhead Wireless Syndicate. Without pretending to any scientific qualifications for discriminating, I may say that each claims some peculiar advantage. The Telefunken system is patronised by Germany and other Continental States; the Fessenden is the cheapest to establish and work; the De Forest was distinguished by the *Times* using it in the Russo-Japanese conflict; and the Lodge-Muirhead, besides boasting the great name of the Principal of Birmingham University, is said to be the favourite of the British military authorities. 'Now why,' the good-natured reader will ask—'why should not all five work harmoniously together?' Why should not the Marconi Company, which has the stations, and has devoted all its revenue for years to perfecting wireless telegraphy, accept messages from one and all of the seventy-three systems perfected without being coerced by a congress? The answer is, first, that it is practically impossible. After long-toil and heavy expense, Mr. Marconi invented a means of securing the privacy of messages by 'tuning' transmitter and receiver to the same 'wavelength.' If the hostile admiral whose 'strange' messages Mr. Wilson describes our admiral as receiving knew our ethereal cipher, he could mislead and destroy our fleets without difficulty. How can a station operator cope with seventy-three ciphers? The pointsman at Clapham Junction would have a comparatively easy task compared to this. Moreover, not only would the Berlin Conference annex our naval secrets, and the hard-earned property and pre-eminence of a British firm, but valuable patent rights would be thrown into hotchpot, and the wireless transmitting business would be carried on by a motley multitude of untrained shipping hands.

A SUGGESTION

If speech had only just been invented, we should certainly choose to have one universal tongue rather than seventy-three. We have already one practically universal and admittedly perfect wireless system; why displace it? Let me repeat, I do not presume to question the scientific eminence of Marconi's competitors or the merit of their inventions. But we are in presence of an accomplished fact. Nobody denies that the Marconi system is at least as good as any, the only one doing practical work, and it has established itself legally. To attack it is to attack the venerable principle distinguishing *meum* from *tuum*. Marconi was the pioneer and first brought wireless messages into practical daily use. Lawyers and diplomatists are bound to come to loggerheads over this matter; and if a layman, ignorant of diplomacy, may venture a suggestion in the character of pacificator, it is this: Let an International Commission be appointed by the Conference, including twelve great electricians, and let the use of valuable improvements which Mr. Marconi's competitors may have devised be leased at a handsome figure to the Marconi Company. That Company even now is willing, in time of war, or in case of danger to any vessel whatever, at any time, to do its best to receive and transmit messages sent or required by vessels fitted with apparatus other than its own. He would be morally bound, if confined in its present position, to accept any reasonable rules and conditions unanimously adopted by the Conference. Whether this suggestion be welcomed or rejected, it is as well that the British people should clearly understand what and whose interests are at stake in the forthcoming Conference.

MEMORABLE MESSAGES

I cannot conclude without alluding to one or two interesting incidents in what one may call the Marconi Epic. What figure in the 'Æneid' is more heroic, in the classical sense, than that of the silent youth, sitting at noon on the 12th of December, 1901, in a room at the old barracks on Signal Hill, near St. John's, Newfoundland? By arrangement his assistants at the Poldhu (Cornwall) station were to telegraph across the Atlantic Ocean the letter S on the Morse Code, represented by three dots, for certain hours each day. On the table was the sensitive receiving apparatus, supplemented for the sake of absolute certainty by a telephone receiver. A wire led out of the window to a huge kite, which the furious wind held 400 feet above him. (One kite and a balloon had been carried out to sea.) He held the telephone receiver to his ear for some time. The critical moment had come for which he had long laboured, for which his 300 patents had prepared the way, for which his Company had erected the costly power station at Poldhu. His face, watched by his assistant, showed

no sign of emotion. Suddenly there sounded the sharp click of the ting 'tapper' as it struck the 'coherer,' showing that something was coming. After a short time, Mr. Marconi handed the telephone receiver to his companion: 'See if you can hear anything, Mr. Kemp.' 'A moment later,' says the writer of a picturesque account of this scene, 'faintly, and yet distinctly and unmistakably, came the three little clicks—the dots of the letter S, tapped out an instant before, in England.' The victory over ocean and space and Nature was won! But not yet over man; for the Anglo-American Cable Company at once served him with an injunction to discontinue his experiments at Newfoundland, as constituting an infringement of their monopoly; an unconscious tribute which the inventor valued more than all the congratulations that poured in upon him. When I think of his ordeal in that little room, with the winter winds raging around, I am reminded of another patient, unconquerable figure, standing, in 1492, on the storm-swept poop of a Spanish ship, with the western gale beating in his teeth and the curses of his crew sounding in his ears. Columbus, too, was an Italian.

The writer may be excused for recalling with special pleasure the fact that on the 16th of July, 1906, the first wireless message was sent across Bass's Straits from the Australian mainland to Tasmania. But, after the eloquent S message whispered across the Atlantic, perhaps the most striking feat was the receipt in October last of a 'Marconigram' from England on H.M.S. *Renown*, escorting the Prince and Princess of Wales to India, at the entrance of the Suez Canal—a message which crossed alps, mountains, and cities of Europe.

The following was the first 'official' wireless despatch sent across the Atlantic on the 19th of January, 1903, from Massachusetts by Mr. Roosevelt:

To his Majesty King Edward the Seventh, London.—In taking advantage of the wonderful triumph of scientific research and ingenuity which has been achieved in perfecting the system of wireless telegraphy, I express on behalf of the American people the most cordial greetings and good wishes to you and all the people of the British Empire.

The *Daily Telegraph* publishes every morning an elaborate Marconi wireless weather report from every port of the Atlantic; so that ships entering a storm zone may be warned from London.

Before concluding, I venture to express a hope that I have written impartially, as I intended. That I have assigned the palm to Mr. Marconi is no proof of unfairness, for no unprejudiced person studying the facts could do otherwise. In self-justification I would quote the words of the American (U.S. Circuit Court) Judge Townsend in a patent action last year:

It would seem, therefore, to be a sufficient answer to the attempts to belittle Marconi's great invention that, with the whole scientific world

awakened by the disclosures of Hertz in 1887 to the new and undeveloped possibilities of electric waves, nine years elapsed without a single practical or commercially successful result, and Marconi was the first to describe and the first to achieve the transmission of definite intelligible signals by means of these Hertzian waves.

There is no such thing as absolute originality in any field of human activity. Rowland Hill was greatly surprised to hear that another Hill had written in Cromwell's time a pamphlet advocating Penny Postage (a copy of which is in the British Museum). But it was Rowland who carried the reform, against bitter opposition. Just as a great book embodies the collective wisdom of preceding writers, and fuses it into priceless gems of truth, so a great inventor, interpreting a fact here and an idea there, deciphers one of Nature's grand secrets, and unfolds the scroll for the benefit of his fellows.

Let me once more express an earnest hope that the fruits of so much genius and labour will not be lightly sacrificed by this great country at the bidding of rapacious foreign Governments.

THE FUTURE OF WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY

May I be allowed to sum up one or two considerations as to the probable influence of wireless telegraphy on the future of our race?

In the first place a severance of communication with any part of the earth—even the Antipodes—will henceforth be impossible. Storms that overthrow telegraph posts, and malice that cuts our cables, are impotent in the all-pervading ether. An explorer like Stanley in the tropical forest, or Geary amid ice-fields, will report daily progress in the *Times*. Every wandering tramp-steamer will have its wireless spar, and will be in constant touch with vessels that dot the ocean all about it. Sir William Preece's dream of signalling to Mars may (say by utilising Niagara for the experiment) yet be realised.

A governing fact is the cheapening of the new force. Everything essential to human happiness is cheap—air, water, the bountiful fruits of the earth—and electricity is no exception. Hitherto the cost of wires has kept this blessing from the bulk of mankind. Already the Marconi Company (in a letter which I possess) offers to telegraph to India at half the present rates, and Mr. Marconi promises messages to America at a penny a word. The speed attained is twenty-five (or with two sets of apparatus, fifty) words per minute.

For some time wireless telegraphy will not replace wire and cable systems. But it will supplement and cheapen them, coming to their aid and the aid of humanity in case of mishap; and meanwhile cutting down rates.

Our ultimate ideal must be instantaneous electrical communication with every man on earth, ashore or afloat, at a cost within the

reach of everyone. To profit from this human necessity is as wrong as it would be to tax speaking or walking. It follows that all the machinery of the world's communications should belong to the State. Let our Government rise to the occasion and buy up all the British Cables and Wireless Company's shares at the market price of the day on which this Review appears. Whether this suggestion will please those companies I know not. I have no pecuniary interest in any; my one thought is, as it always has been, to secure the best, cheapest, and most widely available communication between man and man.

J. HENNIKER-HEATON.

‘THE INSULARITY OF THE ENGLISH’
AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION

• ANOTHER COLONIAL VIEW

‘To a Colonial on a voyage of exploration amongst the elder civilisations of the globe, nothing offers a more fascinating interest than a study of the surviving racial characteristics of the English stock, from which we, the newer English, have sprung.’¹ These are the words of Mr. A. H. Adams, a New Zealander, in his article on the insularity of the English. After two years’ residence at Oxford, and travel in many counties of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales, and in several Continental countries, I would rather write: ‘To a Rhodes scholar on a visit to the home of his fathers, nothing offers a more fascinating interest than a study of those distinguishing racial characteristics that have built up the basis of freedom and sanity on which the newer Colonial nationality may flourish.’

The former writer, illustrating his arguments with references to the climate, food, education and social life of this country, tries to show that the English and Colonials are now racially distinct, and that the Colonials are superior. His conclusion is that union is impossible between England and the Colonies, except as an alliance of distinct nationalities. With many statements that are brought forward one may heartily agree, but with the conclusion reached, and with the superior tone of the article, most Colonials will be quite out of sympathy. The following comments on his article in the chief paper² of his native town will amuse English readers:

The April number of ‘The Nineteenth Century’ has an article by Arthur H. Adams, an old Otago boy, holding up the mirror to the forty millions of home-grown British people for the purpose, amiable but hopeless, of showing them what poor degraded people they are. The home-grown Englishman is a stay-at-home, a stick-in-the-mud, inhabiting a tiny archipelago which limits his whole mental outfit, gives him a coast-bound mind, restricts him to the most rudimentary ideas of travel, forbids him to emerge from that earlier evolutionary stage in

¹ *The Insularity of the English: A Colonial View.* Arthur H. Adams. *The Nineteenth Century*, April 1906.

² *Otago Daily Times*, Dunedin.

which man is a vegetable rooted to one spot. How much wider his outlook on life had he been favoured with the privileges of Arthur H. Adams !

Let us examine some of his statements. The English climate is, to say the least of it, trying. 'Three London fogs would kill a healthy Queenslander,' he writes ; but is the comparison fair ? Three Queensland heat waves would certainly kill the majority of Londoners. Has not that very survival of the fittest, to which Mr. Adams refers, created a race that can laugh at Nature ?

To be personal, my first winter in Oxford was trying to health and depressing to spirits. The second was neither ; I hope the third will be positively exhilarating. Oxford has about as dull a climate as can be found in England ; yet the Master of Balliol, Professor E. Caird, of whom none would say that 'climate had dimmed his life' or 'emaciated his mental outlook,' declares that his health is never so good as at Oxford. The English climate is far from perfect, but surely it would be difficult to prove that it is detrimental to national intellect !

What irony, too, for a Colonial to carp at an Englishman as a 'ruddy, ponderously built product of centuries of meat-feeding.' In Australia it is too hot to eat much meat, or even much food, but can a New Zealander from the land of 'Prime Canterbury' owe his racial characteristics to abstemiousness in meat ? The shearer, whose habit it is never to eat his mutton cold, but to have a fresh hot joint for every meal, will eat more meat this century than his ancestors have eaten in the last two, and, if Mr. Adams' statements are justifiable, where will our poor New Zealand be then ?

But these things are accidents of environment : his real quarrel is with the educational system of this country as typified in Oxford, and with the social life in the homes from which Oxford men come. He is horrified because Oxford teaches 'tone,' while the New Zealand University does not.

'Questions of "tone," of demeanour, of manners and dress do not enter into the New Zealand curriculum.' Taking New Zealand first, as a graduate of the New Zealand University I cannot agree that the 'University has but one purpose, the teaching of useful knowledge.' Is his paraphrase of 'useful knowledge' for 'sound learning' quite just ? Although from force of circumstances most Colonial students undertake a course of study primarily to fit themselves better for winning a livelihood, few, if any, do not hope and believe that their studies and the college life will give them a culture which they could not otherwise attain. Does not the movement for residential colleges, so much afoot in New Zealand at present, show that the want of this culture is felt ? Does not the keen competition for the Rhodes Scholarship show that the students themselves appreciate the value of the Oxford system ? Does not the frequent election of English

graduates to the Professorial Chairs of the various Colonial colleges show that the governing bodies are alive to the same need? Are there not in New Zealand two successful secondary schools, modelled on the English public schools, which can draw boys from all parts of the country simply from their reputation for tone? Questions of tone, of demeanour, of manner and dress—in short, of that unique type called the English gentleman—do not in themselves enter into the Oxford curriculum; and what is more, they do not enter in an inordinate degree into the mind of the undergraduate. There are snobs at Oxford, as elsewhere, and perhaps more than elsewhere, and it is the misfortune of Oxford to be judged in the Colonies by these aberrant types. But for a healthy full life, under favourable formative influences, there is nothing to come up to the two English Universities. The wonderful thing is that the tone, the distinctive qualities that make 'an Oxford man' (and the same naturally applies to Cambridge), come all unconsciously. One recognises a something in the other men that one does not recognise in oneself. This 'spirit' may be due to the old world-surroundings, to the association with the wise men of the past and present, or to the intercourse and shoulder-rubbing with one's fellows, probably in some degree to all. But it comes to everyone who lives the ordinary undergraduate life, unless he be by nature a cad.

Mr. Adams' remarks on the Indian Civil Service show a lack of appreciation and sympathy for some of England's greatest unknown statesmen which can only excite wonder in those who, like the writer, number Indian civilians of the past, the present, and the future among their best friends.

'Oxford,' he continues, 'crushes out individuality.' 'There are brilliant men in Oxford, but they are all brilliant in the same way.' One is tempted to speculate whether this typical brilliance Mr. Adams condemns is not merely a specially bright side of the Oxford 'tone' he deprecates, and the lack of individuality he deplores merely a want of 'push' and 'cheek,' which he would like Englishmen to think is the Colonial characteristic.

'The tremendous cult of sport, the almost sacerdotal ritual of athletics, are in the newer nations almost unknown.'

The average New Zealand boy is every bit as keen on sport as is the English public-school boy. The hero-worship of the New Zealand football team far exceeds that given to Blues, while it is a byword in New Zealand that the national religion of Australia is sport.

In Oxford sport takes a great place in the undergraduate life. Blues certainly receive a great deal more respect than they often deserve. But even here there is a purer element of sport than is to be found in the Colonies. Nearly all men play some game for love of it, and for exercise, while the crowd of 'barrackers' and the gambling touts that characterise Australian sport are almost unknown.

Sport, after all, has a legitimate place in 'Varsity life. Apart from the advantage to limb and muscle, it is a most valuable disciplinary agency. It must be recognised, too, that sport has become a part of national life. It is necessary that some form of 'gymnastics,' in the wide Platonic sense, should be popular in a country where population is crowded, and the great danger of professionalism seems almost inevitable. It is fitting, therefore, that sport should take its right place in 'Varsity life, and that the 'Varsities should be the staunchest bulwarks against its dangers. At Queen's Club, at Putney, one can rely on the game being played and the race rowed in the best of spirits and with the stubbornest endeavour, no slacking, no malingering, no foul play.

'A corollary to the Oxford discipline is the English country life.'

And seeing it is so, I need not enter into details. His picture of the English family is successful—as a caricature. But lest the English girl should think that all Colonials are as ungallant, or have been as unlucky in their acquaintances as Mr. Adams, let me pay my humble homage to the beauty and charm of the girls, the hospitality, the individuality, the knowledge of such English home life as I have been privileged to enjoy.

Enough has been said to show that Mr. Adams has greatly overstated his case against the Englishman. Yet there is a substratum of truth in his indictment. The English climate is bad, and may be conducive to stolidity. There is a certain amount of insular pride, class prejudice, stiffness and want of initiative in the English, taken as a whole. Travel and new conditions of life are no doubt the best correctives. On the other hand, the English race has a history behind it, a history of which any race might feel proud, and of which it is the misfortune of the Colonial to be largely ignorant and unsympathetic. The Englishman is insular because he lives in an island; so is the Japanese; and so let us hope will become the New Zealander, for 'a tight little island' and a glorious history seem to be causally connected.

Let no Colonial ever forget to whom he owes the healthy conditions of his national life, the settled law, the open Bible and religious liberty, the freedom of the press, the literature he inherits. He starts with a freedom of the individual that has taken his parent race a thousand years to fight for, a fight of which the scars still remain in the social system of the parent land. He starts with a superabundance of virgin land, won for him by the daring and hardships of his parents, Englishmen born and bred. He starts with a healthy stock of vigorous manhood inevitable from the early conditions of colonisation. He starts with a freedom from poverty and overcrowding in badly built cities, with all the experience of the centuries to warn him from their dangers. One generation gives him freedom from that Conservatism that is both the strength and

danger of English life, and shall our New Zealander after one brief generation begin to upbraid his Motherland for her slower development and her different political ideals ?

After all, is his own development on the right lines ? Are the Labour laws of New Zealand so dear to the majority of her inhabitants and are they so absolutely sane as Mr. Adams assumes ? That they are in the main just and sane I personally believe, but the spirit in which they have been won, that of pure class selfishness, is one which any thoughtful man must regard with grave mistrust. Opposition to immigration and disregard for the development of industries, characteristics of our Labour party, may yet cost New Zealand many a year of depression.

Coming from a younger country, where social distinctions are not so sharp or insuperable, and where the political parties are not so fixed, the first things to strike a Colonial are the stiffness and the Conservatism of the English, or rather they are the first things he looks for. With good fortune, he soon finds that the personal quality of stiffness is rather rare, or, if present, very much on the surface. The average Englishman is a man of the same flesh and blood, passions, interests and ambitions as the Colonial. He is as keenly alive to the pleasures and duties of life, and to the fact that he must exert himself to win a place in the world. He differs in initiative, mainly because he has less self-confidence, and shrinks from self-assertion.

The Colonial, however, must disagree with the English party system, or rather with the spirit in which it is observed. That it is necessary for a party to combine on more than one question is easily comprehensible, but to take one's ideas from one's party, as so many seem to do, is quite against his independent spirit. But with the true Conservative spirit, without regard to party, the Colonial who stays long enough in England must fall frankly in love. Its soundness, its freedom from rash experiment, its careful weighing of the stakes at issue, its wish to perpetuate all the hard won liberties of the race, all these appeal to the sober judgment. The admiration of this spirit is aided largely by the veneration which the grey monuments of history call forth, the soaring cathedrals and towered castles. It is this spirit of Conservatism, a danger though it is in a country so full of social inequality and evil, that is wanting in the younger generation of the Colonies. Let us hope Mr. Rhodes' scheme will help to introduce it to them.

The idea that Federation of Great Britain and the Colonies is impossible is much exaggerated, and does little justice to the feeling in the Colonies. If there is a white man's burden to be borne, am I not a white man ? If there is a British Empire to be built up and defended, shall I as a Colonial be shut out ? As a Colonial I demand my rightful share in the government of the Empire.

I demand the right to suffer and to make sacrifices for its sake. I know that I speak in the name of the great majority of Colonials.

These are, of course, though they come from the heart, mere words, and some practical suggestion is wanted. To a Colonial nothing seems simpler than that there should be an Imperial Parliament or Council of the Empire, in which should be vested full powers to deal with all Imperial matters—the defence of the Empire, Imperial trade and communications, foreign policy, and the taxation of the Empire for all necessary purposes. Willingly then would the Colonies contribute their fair share of men, money and brains to the Army and Navy. Relieved of these weighty and ever pressing matters, the British Houses of Parliament would be better able to cope efficiently with the burden of local legislation and the aggravated problems of social inequality. The chief difficulty in the way of this Imperial Parliament is the high veneration with which the British Houses are regarded, and the fear of British supremacy being weakened. In fifty years the population of the Colonies may exceed that of the British Isles, and in this Parliament of the Empire, the British Empire, is Britain going to take a subordinate place? Things seem very well as they are, say the parochial M.P.s; the Empire is well run, the Colonies get protection without paying for it; why should they want more? But the Colonies ask whether it is wise to treat growing youths as children if you wish to keep their respect and affection. Soon we shall be grown up, and shall then demand a voice in our own relations with the world.

The suggestion I bring forward is one that does justice to each point of view. Let the Colonies recognise that Britain has built up the Empire, and has governed it on the whole wisely. By every right of possession she is entitled to the largest voice in its direction. Let us have a Parliament of the Empire, a Parliament of two houses, thus preserving the Conservative spirit of the British Constitution. Let the House of Commons of the Empire be such as has been frequently advocated, composed of representatives on some suitable basis from Great Britain, India and the Colonies, and let it have functions similar to those of the British House of Commons. Let the House of Lords of the Empire be elected by the British Government, and have similar functions to those of the House of Lords, holding its position in the eyes of the public (the Colonies) by a similar record of single-hearted service to the Empire. Then need the British nation have no fear that the balance of power will ever depart from its hands, while the Colonials' fullest aspirations will be satisfied.

J. ALLAN THOMSON
(*Rhodes Scholar*).

St. John's College, Oxford.

A RELIGIOUS 'REVIVAL' OF THE RENAISSANCE

MUCH has occurred lately to bring into prominence the subject of Religious Revivals. We have watched the strange phenomena of the revival in Wales, and have tried to analyse the forces at work. We have attempted to trace their relation to human nature in its normal condition, and to estimate what elements of permanent value are likely to emerge from the exceptional conditions under which the revival itself takes place. A study of the Welsh Revival leaves the impression that we are in the presence of psychological forces which we only vaguely understand. But we shall at least recognise that for the appearance of a religious revival two things are necessary—the Time and the Man. There must be some element in the conditions of the time which will induce in the people a readiness to yield to deep emotion, like a train of powder ready to be fired; and then there must appear the man who has the special qualities that will enable him to fire the train.

This has always been the case with the religious revivals of the past. And history never fails to throw light upon present problems. It may therefore be of interest, in this connection, to recall the story of a great religious revival which belongs to that fascinating period of transition when the mediæval world was passing away and the world of modern thought and life was coming to the birth. The religious revival, moreover, associated with the name of Savonarola has a special interest, in respect of both the character of the time and the personality of the man.

For the student of human progress the fifteenth century must always possess a peculiar interest. It witnessed the birth-throes of a new world, the breaking of the fetters of mediæval thought, the growth of a new knowledge, the widening of the horizon of life. The Italian Renaissance, rendered glorious by those marvellous products of art which must make its memory immortal, is at the same time full of the deepest interest on its historical side. Let us examine some of the elements which give it its special character.

Constantinople, till then the focus of Greek learning, had in 1453 fallen before the Turks. The scholars of Eastern Christendom,

driven from their homes, took refuge in the West. Many of them came to Italy, bringing with them precious MSS. of the Greek classics, treasures of which Italian learning had long lost sight. A new realm of thought was thus opened out before scholars, who till then had studied Aristotle through the distorted medium of Arabic commentators. A new revelation of beauty lay outspread before their eyes.

What was the effect of this new culture? On the artistic and intellectual side the result was to give a wonderful stimulus throughout educated Italy. On the moral side the high estimation in which the classics were held was taken as giving a sanction to pagan vices. On the religious side there was manifested a desire to return to paganism, and Marsilio Ficino, the great Florentine philosopher, wrote a treatise in which paganism and Christianity were treated as almost convertible terms.

And what of the Church during this period? The Church was the one institution which, in the Middle Ages, stood before all others in outward distinction and magnificence. It claimed and exercised complete dominion over thought. True, its prestige had been greatly lowered by the Avignon captivity, but its power was still very great and its spiritual sway still undisputed. The terrors of Church censures were still very real, and in the powers of excommunication and of interdict the Church held a weapon that could be used with tremendous effect.

But the Church, outwardly so powerful, was inwardly a mass of corruption. An almost complete divorce of religion from morals had taken place. Superstition has been defined as the expectation of supernatural results without moral co-operation, and, in this sense, superstition was supreme. The Sacraments were treated as mechanical agencies which would produce their effect without any moral co-operation on the part of the recipients. The corruption of the Roman Curia was almost beyond belief, and reached in Alexander Borgia its nadir of infamy.

In Italy, then, the Church was regarded with superstitious awe, was largely a power for evil, and was almost entirely inoperative as a power for good.

But in the closing decades of the fifteenth century the old and the new were engaged in a struggle, of which the significance could not yet be fully seen. Indeed, the tendency might have seemed, at first sight, to be not towards the birth of a new world, but the re-birth of the old; not the forming of a new civilisation, a new philosophy, but a return to that of ancient Greece; not the setting free of thought, but the exchange of one bondage for another, of scholasticism for Platonism.

But the sway of Platonism was only a phase of the movement. The true forces lay deeper. A vast movement was on foot to break

through the old chain of superstition and of false scholastic method, and to set Europe free for an intellectual and religious advance. Of this movement Savonarola was, half-consciously, half-unconsciously, the prophet and the martyr.

It was at the darkest moment of religious corruption in the fifteenth century that a voice was heard echoing through Italy and proclaiming, with reiterated emphasis, three assertions: 'The Church shall be scourged,' 'The Church shall be regenerated,' 'These things shall happen swiftly.' It was the voice of a Dominican monk, Fra Girolamo Savonarola, of Ferrara, and the words quoted were the three great 'conclusions' (for so he called them) which were to form the burden of his preaching to the end.

He was born at Ferrara in 1452, and brought up at the court of the Marquis, his grandfather Michele having been Court physician. His training had been the accepted education of the times in scholastic philosophy. He became a master of the methods of St. Thomas Aquinas, and was destined for a brilliant life in the world. But the world, with its corruptions, had no attraction for him, and it was inevitable that he should enter the cloister. So in 1474 he was received into the Dominican monastery at Bologna, and after seven years came to Florence, where he entered the convent of St. Mark.

To the modern visitor the stones of Florence seem to speak of Savonarola at every turn. To stand in the convent of St. Mark—now, alas! a museum—is to bring back vividly the memory of the greatest of its priors, with those prominent features so well known to us through Fra Bartolommeo's portrait. We study the frescoes of Fra Angelico on its walls, and we remember that it was upon them that the eyes of Savonarola, too, were accustomed to rest. The calm, unquestioning faith they show must have given many a message of encouragement to the hard-pressed monk in his great struggle. We stand in San Lorenzo, and we think of it as the scene of his failure; in the Duomo, and it recalls the marvels of his success. Once again it seems to be alive with the throng of upturned faces, with eyes fixed upon the preacher, who holds them spellbound by his words. We gaze at that strange tower of the Palazzo Vecchio, and we think of that cell, high up within its walls, where with tortured body, but soul unshaken, the last hours were spent in composing his meditations on the fifty-first Psalm; or we stand in the Piazza Signoria, and seem to see again that cross-shaped gibbet upon which, as a martyr, he died.

Let us recall the circumstances under which Savonarola arrived in Florence. The city was under the despotic rule of Lorenzo de' Medici. Though keeping the forms of a republic, the Medici family had, in fact, usurped the entire power of government. Their rule was a tyrannical one, involving the grinding down of the poor by arbitrary taxes, and the oppression or exile of all who were not of

their party. In the character of Lorenzo the Magnificent appears a curious medley—on the one side an enlightened patronage of learning and of the arts, on the other a degrading licentiousness. The intellectual atmosphere which he encouraged was one of Platonic philosophy and classical culture. The Bible was condemned as bad Latin. The scholar and the dilettante refused to read it for fear of corrupting the purity of their style.

Such were the leaders of thought and of manners when Savonarola came to Florence in 1481. Society was licentious, the Church was utterly corrupt. No voice was heard in the pulpit to condemn the crying sins of the day. Sermons, indeed, were readily listened to provided that the preacher was not guilty of the bad taste of rebuking immorality, and provided always that his style followed the correct classical models, so that his words might provide an oratorical feast for the fastidious ears of his cultured hearers.

We need not then be surprised that, when in 1482 Savonarola was appointed Lent preacher in San Lorenzo, he should have completely failed to hold his audience. It was no time, he felt, for soft words and rounded periods such as were employed by the fashionable preachers of the day, who, with apt quotations from Plato and allusions to pagan mythology, attracted audiences large in proportion to the correctness of their style. But the rugged speech of Savonarola did not please these fastidious admirers of classical diction. They smiled at his denunciations or met them with a stony stare of indifference. His day had not yet come.

He left Florence, sick at heart at the corruptions of the Church and of society and at his failure to reach the people. For seven years he worked in the towns of North Italy, and then in 1489 he was recalled to Florence by his superiors, apparently at the request of Lorenzo himself.

At this point let us pause in the narrative to try to estimate his character and his equipment for his work.

We notice first of all his vivid faith, which shows itself in a deep spirit of devotion, in an overmastering sense of the immediate presence of God. His belief is strong in God's providence and justice; his conviction is deep that God's justice must and shall be vindicated; the wicked shall be punished. His three central 'conclusions' may be said to be the outcome of these general principles. 'The Church shall be scourged,' 'The Church shall be regenerated,' 'These things shall happen swiftly.' But, unfortunately, he did not rest content with declaring his 'conclusions.' He laid down the way in which they were to be realised. He is not content with saying 'God's justice shall be vindicated.' He declares the specific worldly means through which this shall be done. Thus he claims the gift of prophecy. And certainly, in a most remarkable way, his prophecies seemed to find fulfilment. Thus, when in 1491 a deputation of distinguished

Florentine citizens was sent to him by Lorenzo, to induce him to modify his denunciations, he foretold, what then seemed most unlikely, the early deaths of Lorenzo himself, of the Pope, and of the King of Naples. This prophecy, which is well authenticated, received a striking fulfilment. In the next year, 1492, Lorenzo and Innocent the Eighth both died, and in 1494 Ferdinand of Naples followed them to the *gravè*.

Connected with his belief in his gift of prophecy is his belief in visions. These are sometimes striking, sometimes fantastic. They are made from time to time the subject of his sermons. Thus, for instance, he sees a hand stretched out from heaven holding a sword, directed towards a city on the earth, and bearing the words '*Gladius Domini super terram cito et velociter*'—a vision which has an obvious bearing upon his 'conclusions,' the city probably being Rome.

And, once again, this same mystic temperament leads him eagerly to expect a miracle. To one who believes that God constantly speaks to him through visions, the expectation of miracle becomes natural. So we read of that strange scene in the Piazza of St. Mark, in which he stands aloft in the pulpit, facing the vast throng with the Host in his hands, and invites a thunderbolt from the blue sky above to strike him down if his words have been false. It is true he never said that a miracle would take place, but the possibility was ever present to him, and so, when circumstances began to turn against him, he had laid himself open to the taunt: 'Prophet, show us your miracle.'

It is this element in Savonarola's character which marks him so clearly as belonging to a period of transition. He is still in great measure the child of the Middle Ages, though at the same time the prophet of the new era. His strength lies in his deep spirituality, his intense earnestness, his fearlessness, his hatred of evil, and his love of the people; his weakness in the insecurity of his visionary and prophetic claims, and his proneness to arrive at the conclusion that God must work in a particular way.

When Savonarola returned to Florence in 1489 he quickly caught the ear of the people. Doubtless his preaching was by this time more matured. In any case, his terrible denunciations and earnest exhortations, which echoed through St. Mark's like the words of some Old Testament prophet, drew a crowd of hearers, which soon exceeded the capacity of the convent church. So in Lent 1491 his voice was first heard in the Duomo. What a wonderful sight must those vast and ever-increasing audiences have been, which day after day through Lent thronged the great church, to listen to his warnings and his call! Utterly fearless, he spares none; neither those who have sold the Church, nor scholars with their immoral lives, nor those guilty of oppression in high places, nor even Lorenzo himself.

What was the effect upon Lorenzo? He was compelled to admire the fearless monk. By overtures of friendship, he tried to seduce

him, but in vain. He then selected one of his courtier preachers, Fra Mariano, to denounce the new prophet from the pulpit. But Mariano's intemperate language recoiled upon himself, and Savonarola was unscathed. Very remarkable is the scene of the following year, historic in fact, though probably apocryphal in detail, when Lorenzo, lying on his death-bed, sends for the fearless monk, now Prior of St. Mark's, as being the only priest whose absolution would satisfy him. All others would be afraid to speak truth to him. Savonarola alone could be trusted. But Lorenzo, it is said, refused to make the restitution demanded of him, and Savonarola left the presence of the dying man without pronouncing absolution.

The worthless character of Piero de' Medici, Lorenzo's successor, produced a deepening discontent among the people of Florence and an increasing eagerness to hear Savonarola's sermons. They listened spellbound to his denunciations and his prophecies of coming punishment. And, indeed, his words seemed likely to be swiftly verified. For the rumour spread that Charles the Eighth, the new King of France, had resolved to invade Italy, in pursuit of his fantastic claims to the crown of Naples. In this threatened invasion Savonarola saw the hand of God. Charles was a new Cyrus, through whom the Church was to be purged of its corruptions. And so he hailed his coming and, from the pulpit, welcomed the approach of the French army as the agent of God.

It is easy to be wise after the event. We can see the evil which the coming of the French brought to Italy. We may say that Savonarola was too hasty in hailing the expedition, when he knew so little of the character of Charles; that he was too eager to see in this invasion the fulfilment of his prophecy. But at all events the immediate result, in the confusion that followed the near approach of the French and the flight and treachery of Piero, was to greatly strengthen the Frate's position. For he alone possessed the confidence of the citizens; to him alone could they turn for advice. At this moment of popular fury and indignation against the Medici, the smallest provocation would have led them to sack the rich houses of their oppressors and the streets of Florence would have been red with blood. But, by a wonderful display of moral force, the Prior of St. Mark's held the great multitude in perfect control. Never had there been such a revolution in Florence as this, by which the Medici were expelled. Not a drop of blood was shed. The triumph of the Frate was complete. It was a triumph of moral forces over brute passions.

Nor did his work end there. His leadership was still indispensable. He must go to the French camp as ambassador of the city, for he alone can influence the King; he must reconstruct the government of the city; the building up of the new Florentine Republic must be his work. He alone was competent to undertake it.

For the old instincts of government had been crushed out of the

people by sixty years of Medicean oppression. How, then, were they to set about establishing their new institutions? Bewilderment and hesitation marked the anxious deliberations of the Signory. And so it came about that the one man who possessed the confidence of the people was constrained to lead. Savonarola felt driven by stress of events to take his place in politics. His motive is clear. He entered politics because he felt that they were intimately associated with morality. It was essential to establish a form of government which would exclude the Medicean despotism, with its licentiousness and oppression. He has been blamed for his interference. But his action is certainly not to be judged by twentieth-century notions. Our own long line of ecclesiastical statesmen from Dunstan to Wolsey reminds us that, when ideas of civil government are as yet undeveloped, the Church may usefully act as the guardian of the State, and its representatives shape its politics. Certainly Savonarola, with his extraordinary knowledge of affairs, his political acumen, and his keen insight into Florentine institutions and into the character of the Florentine people, was able to render great service to the city in the reconstruction of its government upon sound democratic lines after the expulsion of the Medici.

This political work, however, was but subordinate to Savonarola's main object—the reform of moral life. During Lent 1495 he preached a wonderful course of sermons on the Book of Job. His deep earnestness, the mystery of his revelations and visions, filled men with the vivid sense that here was a man who held converse with God, whose prophecies had been fulfilled, who was now speaking with God's message. As Lent advanced, his form became emaciated, but his eye burnt with fiercer fire. His appeal became more penetrating, his words more passionate. Now he held the Crucifix aloft, appealing to the vast throng by the love of God, now he threw himself forward in the pulpit with arms outstretched as though his own love for the people would gather them to himself from the paths of sin. And how wonderful was the result! The city seemed utterly changed. Ribaldry and licentiousness disappeared from the streets, and the churches were crowded with worshippers, the poor-boxes filled with alms. Fra Girolamo's triumph seemed complete. It was a religious revival indeed!

But already there were signs of the coming change. Savonarola could see beneath the surface. He himself never seems to have been in doubt as to his end. He must die a martyr's death. Such a mission as his could have no other close.

Let us trace the elements of the growing enmity to his work. Within the city itself the party of the Arrabbiati were his bitter enemies. They were the party of aristocratic licentiousness, who hated the Frate for the double reason that it was his influence that had liberalised the city institutions, and that he had now suppressed the open

flaunting of vice and licence. Even as early as December 1494 they had managed to secure a brief from Rome, ordering Savonarola to leave Florence. There were many dissolute young men among them who longed to compass the ruin of the man who had made their lives dull by his successful crusade against immorality.

But Fra Girolamo's enemies within the city found a powerful ally in the Pope. It is easy to imagine the fury of Alexander Borgia against the man who dared to denounce the corruptions of the Church. Indeed, the Papacy had reached the lowest depth of degradation. Sixtus the Fourth, Innocent the Eighth, and Alexander the Sixth sat in succession in the chair of St. Peter. The Papacy could not sink lower. Alexander was the father of six or seven children; he owed his election to unblushing simony, the votes of the cardinals having been shamelessly bought. What wonder then that his fury blazed out against the man who dared to denounce the sins of the Curia and the clergy, and whose avowed aim it was to secure the summoning of a general council for the purpose of reforming the Church?

We can understand the difficulty in which Savonarola, as a loyal son of the Church, was placed by his conflict with the Pope. He was forbidden to preach, and he obeyed. But doubts began to shape themselves in his mind. Was obedience a duty? Was Alexander really Pope? Did not simony invalidate the election? But still he continued to obey; still he kept silence, while the people of Florence became increasingly anxious to hear his voice. At last the Signory obtained from Rome the removal of the inhibition, and decreed that the Frate should preach in the Duomo during the coming Lent, 1496. That vast interior must have presented a wonderful sight when Savonarola returned to the pulpit after his enforced silence. The floor was packed from end to end, while all around the walls wooden galleries had been erected and were crowded with children. Yet even then his life was in danger from attacks by the Arrabbiati.

A change had necessarily come over his sermons. He could no longer speak simply of morality. He had to justify his action in regard to Rome. So he made emphatic statements of his Catholic obedience and his submission to the authority of the Church. But he qualified the duty of obedience. The Pope may not give any commands contrary to faith or charity. If he should do so, it becomes a duty to disobey.

Meanwhile the hostility of the Pope, carefully fomented by the Friar's enemies at Rome, became daily more intense. Moreover, the party hostile to him in Florence itself was growing in strength, and on Ascension Day, 1497, they were able to raise a riot against him and to defile the pulpit in which he was to preach. This evidence of enmity against Savonarola led the Pope to believe that the time had now come for extreme measures. So, on the 13th of May 1497, a

brief of excommunication was launched against the Friar, and the city was threatened with an interdict if the excommunication were not observed. Thus, in a moment, the Arrabbiati became triumphant, and immorality once more flaunted itself in the streets. Savonarola was silenced. At Christmas, however, he determined to celebrate and preach. The excommunication, he said, was invalid; it would be wrong to observe it any longer; Alexander was no true Pope. But once again he was compelled to be silent. The Signory, dreading the effect of an interdict upon the commerce of their city, held that the preaching must be forbidden.

From this time forward events hurried rapidly to the close. The drama was brought to a swifter finish by the strange event of the Ordeal by Fire. But even apart from that humiliating fiasco, the enmity of the Arrabbiati and of the Pope must soon have compassed his fall. On the 8th of April, 1498, the day after the failure of the Ordeal, the Compagnacci made an attack upon St. Mark's. Then came the surrender of Savonarola to the Signory; then the terrible weeks of trial, torture, and falsification of evidence, closed by the martyrdom on the 23rd of May.

What, then, is the significance of Savonarola's life? What was the permanent value of the religious revival which he inspired? As prophet, preacher, visionary, mystic, politician, martyr, he presents an extraordinary personality. He is a creation of the times of transition in which he lived, showing on the one side the old view of nature, the old philosophy, artificial methods of reasoning from artificial premises. Yet in his contact with real life, its needs, its corruptions, he asserts his freedom. A human heart beats in his breast, a human soul seeks for God and strives to lead men to righteousness, feeling dimly the birth of a new world and desiring to lead his people towards it. He accepts without questioning the ecclesiastical system of his day. Even when resisting the excommunication, he asserts his submission to the Catholic Church. He had no thought of a schism. He longed to reform the Church from within. He failed.

If only he had succeeded, how glorious might have been the future of Christendom! The outward unity of the Church might then have been preserved. But it was not to be so. The Church, as he had said, was to be scourged, and in a terrible way. Division was to rend the robe of Christ.

Savonarola died a martyr, as was inevitable. He seemed to have failed. But assuredly his life and preaching were not in vain. Many souls must have been drawn to God, many lives saved from ruin by his influence; there must have been many who found in him a rock on which to lean in those strange days, when the very foundations of thought seemed to be broken up, when infidelity and immorality held almost undisputed sway, when a new world was coming to the birth. It was indeed a Time which called for a religious revival, and with

the need there arose the Man, who in wonderful measure was able to respond to the call.

It would be well if ministers of religion of the present day would seek an inspiration from the work of the great Dominican, a true *Domini canis* or watch-dog of the Lord. Let them learn from him to study the special conditions of the times in which they live, so that their message may be real. Let them remember that they are citizens as well as clergy, and that no true interest of the people is alien from their work.

J. C. V. DURELL.

GEORGE GISSING

ONE evening, late in the year 1882, two very small boys were sitting on the stairs in a London house, junketing merrily on an assortment of viands and delicacies purloined from the dining-room, where a dinner party was proceeding, yet with much dread in the inner man. For the first time in their lives stern reality fronted them. On the morrow at 9 A.M. they were to begin life by initiation into the past. The golden age was over, the gossamer reign of licit irresponsibility; they were to have a tutor. No wonder if a few tears—the last tears of babyhood—fell sympathetically into the champagne glass beside them. The talk was of thwackings and impositions.

Punctually to the minute on the next day the front door bell rang. How vividly I can recall the agony of suspense ensuing! My brother, who even at that age was ever drawing, broke his slate pencil; we rose as the door opened, and there walked into the room one of the gentlest looking beings we had ever seen. With the instinctive perception of children we measured our man at a glance. Before the lesson began we had both ceased to fear him, long before it was finished he had become a dear friend. He talked to us of the Greeks and Romans with boisterous enthusiasm; gave us quaint Latin terminations to our names, and we, struck by his gentleness and the singular pathos of his countenance, retorted with 'Gissinus-y creature'—and as such he was known to us to the very end.

Tall, spare, and lissom of movement, George Gissing had a marked personality even then. Here is a conscious autobiographical portrait of himself taken from his first novel, *Workers in the Dawn*. 'His eyes were of light blue, his nose was of a Grecian type, his lips and chin were moulded in form expressive of extreme sensibility and gentleness of disposition, showing traces, moreover, of instability in moral character.' Thick, brown hair clustered round a brow of noble shape; his head was well shaped. Though his cheeks lacked colour he looked healthy, strong and vigorous. His facial expression was extraordinarily mobile, sensitive, and intellectual. I have never seen so sad and pathetic a face. In repose his features contracted into a look of ineffable dreariness, sorrow and affliction, of mute submissiveness and despair. Yet it was a noble face, dignified, delicate, sensuous,

thoughtful. And then it would flash and light up, and the eyes would beam in radiant transport, and the misanthrope would become a tempestuous schoolboy, and he would thump the table and positively shout with buoyant exuberance. For there was ever laughter in his heart—spontaneous, boisterous, sincere laughter. Gissing, the sad man, had the zest of life, and with it its joy. At times he would laugh so uproariously at lessons that my father, at work in the adjoining room, would come in to see what was amiss. And the Homeric joke would be repeated and we would all laugh the louder and merrier.

Let me say at once that it is no purpose of mine to lift the veil of mystery overhanging Mr. Gissing's life, to disturb what Michelet called *le désintéressement des morts*. Gissing's life was an infinitely sad, an infinitely pathetic one. To him it was decreed: 'Thou shalt live alone.' In the bitter years of pursuit and attainment he wrought literally in solitude, unknown. He had but one friend, an author like himself, whom he saw at rare intervals. He chose to live fiercely independent, proud and resentful, at war with the whole social organism. For years he was a kind of literary miser, spurning mankind, scorning sympathy: he, one of the kindest, gentlest natures that ever breathed, with his soul bared to the lash of circumstance. Fate made him a ferocious individualist. The world frightened him, and, as he himself says somewhere, 'a frightened man is no good for anything.' His repining spirit trod its own Calvary.

Legend has been both kind and unkind. It has woven a convention around his life, derived in the main from the autobiographical nature of his writings: in part fictitious, in part too grossly misleading and fantastic. The man whom none knew in life is now crowned with the wreath of posthumous compassion. Extremes lead to extremes. And so it has come about that Gissing has gone down to posterity as a man whose whole life was consumed in the reek of slum and garret, who for twenty years starved literally in the nether world of our great capital. As it was my privilege to have known Gissing from the very outset of his literary career and to have remained in more or less unbroken relationship with him till his sad death at St. Jean de Luz two years ago, perhaps I may be permitted to correct the perspective of certain erroneous impressions which it can now serve no useful purpose to maintain.

As a boy Gissing had been the prodigy of his school; he worked madly (as Mr. Wells¹ has said); 'already out of touch with life,' a lonely portent. From there he went to Owens College, Manchester, where in a career of meteoric brilliance he carried off all the first prizes, scholarships and exhibitions, and took first-class honours for English and classics in the University of London. From that time²

¹ *Monthly Review*, August 1904.

² *Ibid.*

'his is a broken and abnormal career.' It matters little now. Suffice it to say that at the height of a young life of quite unusual promise one of those aberrations of mental balance took place which in men of genius, alas! is by no means uncommon, and that the penalty was severe and, in Gissing's case, decisive upon his whole future. As he himself wrote many years later: 'Within my nature there seemed to be no faculty of self-guidance.'³ The boy was dead. His life's struggle began. He fled to America. There he taught the classics for a space, dabbled a little in print, but his fierce spirit could find no rest; he broke away from the restraint of cities, roved penniless through the States, racked and distraught, and at last stood before the majesty of Niagara hesitating, as he often related to us, between life and death. He returned and went to Germany.

He taught and studied. In the quiet atmosphere of a German university town he found guidance and inspiration. He read Schiller, Goethe, Häckel, Schopenhauer, innumerable German tomes on ancient philosophy, Lucian, Petronius, and what not. In *Workers in the Dawn* he has left a faithful record of his own mind-growth. From Schopenhauer he turned to Comte, whose 'Philosophie Positive' profoundly impressed him. His leisure hours he spent in conversations with a learned German, at the time *Privat-docent*, with whom he remained in life-long friendship. The two young men discussed metaphysics and religion with German thoroughness and system. At one period he nearly became a Catholic. 'Yes, how much have I to thank Germany for,' he writes in *Workers in the Dawn*. 'I came here with a mind rudely ploughed by the ploughshare of anguish. . . . How well I remember the day when I took up Strauss's *Leben Jesu*. The book was to me like the first ray of heavenly light piercing the darkness of a night of anguish and striving and woe unutterable.' Hope returned to him. He acquired merit; he learnt the joy of struggling with the world. 'At no stage in its struggle is a human mind contemptible,' he wrote; 'for as long as it *does* struggle it asserts its native nobility, its inherent principle of life.'

Schopenhauer, Comte, and Shelley—these three in turn have directed the growth of my moral life. Schopenhauer taught me to forget myself and to live in others. Comte then came to me with his lucid unfolding of the mystery of the world, and taught me the use to which my sympathy should be directed. Last of all Shelley, breathed with the breath of life on the dry bones of scientific theory, turned conviction into passion, lit the heavens of the future with such glorious rays that the eye struggles in gazing upwards, strengthened the heart with enthusiasm as with a coat of mail.⁴

And again:

With a heart full of noble phantasies and lofty aspirations; beating high with an all-embracing affection for earth and the children of earth, bred of a

³ *Henry Ryecroft*.

⁴ *Workers in the Dawn*.

natural ardour of disposition, and nurtured upon the sweet and mighty thoughts of great men; with a heart yearning for action of some kind, weary of a life bounded within the lines of self-study, desirous of nothing more than to efface the recollection of woe in complete devotion to the needs of those sufferers.

Gissing set foot once more in England. He had come to the conclusion that the true destination of philosophy must be social and practical; he determined to write. The result was *Workers in the Dawn*, a crude, incondite work in three volumes—in some ways the most powerful book he ever wrote. I have quoted from it because it is an unknown work and because it reveals the true Gissing of that time, the aching soul of torment and desire, the artist and pessimist. It is admittedly partly autobiographical. The hero, finding the world void and remorseless, plunges into the waters of Niagara. The writing is curiously raw and amateurish, which is instructive, as Gissing was then a scholar of real distinction, and was shortly to become one of the few great living writers of prose in the English language. Very few people have ever seen this book. Gissing, it so happened, had inherited the sum of one hundred pounds, and with this he published his first novel. But in those days there were no literary agents, and Gissing was an unknown scribe. He laughed long and loud when the bill came in for printing an edition of his book, which left him with a few shillings in his pocket. Only a few copies were sold; he was now face to face with hunger and destitution.

He sent the book to my father and, I think, to Mr. John Morley. Both agreed as to its power and interest. An interview followed; my father was deeply impressed with the forlorn figure of the young scholar and writer, and so by a fortunate coincidence my brother and I gained a tutor, and the tutor a livelihood. Gissing taught us from that day uninterruptedly till the autumn of the year 1884; and I make claim to affirm that from that moment the story of Gissing starving in garret and cellar, swinking all day and night with lard and dripping for his nourishment and the wooden boards for his pillow, is the fiction of fiction. A poor man certainly he was, but from the year 1882 Gissing never 'starved,' as he is commonly represented to have done. Through us he taught a son of Mr. Montague Crackanthorpe, K.C., the daughters of Mr. Vernon Lushington, and various other pupils whose names need not be mentioned. What is worth noting is that from the year 1882—two years before, that is, Gissing's first novel, *The Unclassed*, appeared—he was in receipt of a livable income derivable from teaching, which he could always increase or modify at will, and that for some years subsequently he did exist by this form of journeywork, while devoting the whole of his leisure and industry to novel writing. The sickness of real poverty Gissing never knew after the year 1882, when his literary career in fact began. Previously, without doubt, he had experienced very rough times—in America, where he nearly starved,

and later in London on his return from Germany. What I wish to point out is not that Gissing was not a poor man ; not that he did not suffer physically and mentally ; not that his whole life was not more or less of a struggle to make two ends meet, but that after the publication of *The Unclassed*, and subsequently during the whole of his literary career, he was not the necessitous starving writer convention has depicted him ; not in any true sense of the word the literary jetsam of garret and cellar tossed hither and thither by poverty and hunger in the grim immensity of London. When Gissing lived in Milton Street, in Chelsea, behind Madame Tussaud's, at Cornwall Residences and elsewhere, from 1882 to 1890, my brother and I used frequently to visit him, and great times we had together ; great teas, great talks and laughter. Sometimes we would drop in unexpectedly, and find Gissing and his friend in the fever of literary conversation, smoking and drinking pint after pint of tea. Sometimes we would go for long tramps with him to Harrow or Kew, and without ceasing Gissing would talk of his work and experiences, shouting with laughter at some of his stories of life in what he called 'the glorious black depths of London,' and on such occasions he would race us, walking or running with boyish zest and agility.

To tell the truth, in all practical things Gissing was idle and inept. He had in marked degree the artistic temper ; if he remained poor it was largely because he chose to. My father introduced him to Mr. John Morley, at the time editor of the *Pall Mall*, who published a charming sketch of Gissing's, 'On Battersea Bridge.' We implored him to write again. But Gissing refused. He hated editors ; he was no journalist, he said ; he could not degrade himself by such 'trash.' In truth, at any time after 1882, Gissing could have obtained a place as critic or writer on some journal, which would have enabled him to write at leisure. But he would never hear of such a thing. My father begged him to accept some post, but Gissing declined to 'serve.' Gissing positively chose to live in strife. He writes a pathetic note to my mother, the 6th of July, 1884 :

A kind of exhaustion possesses me when I sit at my desk a quarter of an hour, and my will power gets weaker. At most I am able to produce a short poem now and then of a very savage character. Of course all this means that the conditions of my life are preposterous. There is only one consolation, that, if I live through it, I shall have materials for darker and stronger work than any our time has seen. If I can hold out till I have written some three or four books, I shall at all events have the satisfaction of knowing that I have left something too individual in tone to be neglected.

After that he went with us for three weeks to Bonscale in the Lakes.

Really Gissing's trouble was himself ; he made his own poverty ; he could not be practical. He used to fall into fits of despondency and gloom, when he would sally out into the streets, and walk through

the night. He was an outrageous pessimist. Four days in the week he would write from nine in the evening till four A.M., and on the fifth day he would marvel that what he called the 'bilious fever' had fallen upon him. It was not that Gissing was so poor—many a German student, and the mother of many an officer of nobility in the German Army, have less than Gissing had to live on—but that in all affairs of the world he was a very child, with a child's obstinacy and improvidence.

Here, in a letter addressed to my father, the 17th of August, 1884, Milton Street, is the Gissing of that period. My father was anxious that Gissing should take up the tuition of my two younger brothers, as my brother and I were going to school. He writes:

With reference to your proposal concerning the little boys. Should you in very deed think that I can be of use with them I need not say how unreservedly I offer myself for the work. On the other hand, should the suggestion have originated only in kind forethought for myself, I have a sort of feeling that possibly it would be better for me to burn my ships, and commence in downright earnest the combat with the beasts of Ephesus—otherwise, with publishers in London—an absurdly mixed metaphor, by the way. Moreover, when young [another pupil] went away, his father distinctly asked me if I should be able to resume work in October so that almost a livelihood would be assured in that way for some months. . . . I have plans of all kinds—for a play, for articles, &c. Some day I shall of course look back with sad amusement at these initial struggles—and with keen enough feelings towards all who helped me.

So that in the year 1884 we find Gissing declining further pupils on the ground that for the time being a livelihood was assured him. *The Unclassed* had already appeared.

Gissing was an artist; a contemplative individualist; a man influenced by the mood of the sky, the procession of the year; by circumstance and environment. To understand and even to sympathise fully with him one must remember that all his hopes and ambitions had been shattered at the most impressionist period of his life; that he had been shipwrecked, as it were, at the outset of his progress in the world; and that, as a consequence, the youth had been transformed into a hard and bitter man. By nature he was made for the life of tranquillity and meditation, for cultured leisure and repose. Constitutionally he was an idealist, a dreamer, an impressionist, a scholar. In other circumstances he might have been a university don, a famous scholar, have amassed learning and fame. He worshipped the old, the dusty volumes of dead languages; vellum and parchment. I have seen him take up a worm-eaten copy of an old chronicle or Greek author and caress it as a child will stroke the coat of some fond animal. A library was to him a garden of roses; he loved books as women love flowers: emotionally, instinctively. He had a Grecian love for all beauty.

But in truth Gissing looked, and had to look, back upon beginnings of life deformed and discoloured. Unlike other men, he practically

began life with no disillusion to face. He came to London in a spirit of pride and revolt which struggled to find expression. Gissing was no philosopher, no Socialist reformer, he was not even a profound thinker. He was, as he himself says, an 'egoist in grain.' He deliberately regarded himself as a sort of social outlaw, making a virtue of self-indulgence and self-concentration, fostering the hunger of querulous self-pity. He gloried in the vanity of self-compassion. In literature he thought of poverty in avoirdupois. He revelled in the gloom of London's misery. Every fibre of him betrayed the artist, and because he was an artist he was also an aristocrat. His delight in poverty, in misery, and in vice was purely artistic and consciously egoistical. His social enthusiasm was purely literary, emotional, artistic. In *The Unclassed* he laid bare his confessions. 'The zeal,' he writes, 'on behalf of the suffering masses was nothing more nor less than disguised zeal on behalf of my own starved passions.' He passed rapidly through the phases of Socialism, Radicalism, philanthropic enthusiasm.

I have only to go out into the streets all night to come across half a hundred scenes of awful suffering or degradation, every one of which fills me with absolute joy. 'Think you Hogarth would have rejoiced in the destruction of Gin Lane? Never believe it! . . . My artistic egotism bids fair to ally itself with vulgar selfishness. I am often tempted to believe that one great work of art embodying human misery would be ample justification of the whole world's anguish.'

And in the same way Gissing took an artistic pleasure in physical pain. This body is but as the cottage or clothing of the mind. 'Let flesh be racked,' he writes in *Henry Ryecroft*. 'I, the very I, will stand apart, lord of myself.' Once, I can recall, Gissing was suffering from severe toothache, and my mother urged him to have the tooth taken out with gas. But Gissing would not hear of such a thing. He wished to feel pain, and on the next day at luncheon he gave us a vivid description of the agony he had endured. Thus his vision was blighted, and his mind soured. He scorned the carpet-author, writing at leisure on a fat salary. He loved to flesh his satire upon the lad entering the literary profession with 'parental approval and ready avuncular support.' His whole soul relucted at the idea of leisured literary conception. He wrote, thought, and lived as an artist. As an artist he must be judged.

Listen to Gissing on the people in the dress of Henry Ryecroft :

I am no friend of the people. As a force, by which the tenor of the time is conditioned, they inspire me with distrust, with fear; as a visible multitude, they make me shrink aloof, and often move me to abhorrence. . . . Every instinct of my being is anti-democratic, and I dread to think of what our England may become when Demos rules irresistibly.

Sentiments, those, of a pure aristocrat, yet written in the mellow serenity of age, when his life's work was done. I wrote to him on

^a *The Unclassed*.

reading those words, and this is what he answered in a letter written at Ciboure late in the summer of 1903, a few months before his death :

Of a truth, I did not mean to be hard upon the poor. There are human sweepings in London and elsewhere, with which I hold no terms of kindness, but 'the poor'—the decent, hard-working man or woman who will never know what it is to feel secure of next month's food and lodging, with *them* I sympathise profoundly. I do not say that we should get on well together—we should not ; but that is my fault as much as theirs.

In a letter to my father (29th of June, 1884) Gissing makes some interesting remarks about himself :

Surely, there is a sense wanting in me. . . . I feel the irresistible impulse to strive after my ideal of artistic excellence. It is true, as you said, that I have a quarrel with society, and that, I suppose, explains the instinct. But the quarrel is life-long ; ever since I can remember I have known this passionate tendency of revolt. It has sought for satisfaction in many schools and many modes of life. I write these social passages in a fury ; but I scribbled in precisely the same temper when I was ten years old. If only I could hear someone speak a word for a tendency which in me is an instinct ! I must ask you to let me try to express something of the gratitude I feel for your persistent kindness—kindness holding on in spite of everything.

The secret of Gissing's life was that his was an ill-balanced nature, lacking in firmness and volition. By constitution of mind an idealist, he was dependent upon external influences for the shape which his idealism should for the time assume. If noble impulse directed his activity, adverse circumstance forbade the implanted seeds from growing into a rich individuality. Yet Gissing was very English. He hated Pecksniff, and, though he described his countrymen as an Old Testament people, he was himself very insular in many things, and a bit of a Philistine. His hatred of parsimony, poverty ; his almost snobbish respect for social position, his hyper-sensitiveness to his own ; his shrinkage into scorn of his fellow-creatures ; his fierce spirit of independence, intolerance ; his love of air, and freedom, and nature ; his shyness—though no man ever lived with a greater capacity for mirth ; his love of comfort, hatred of control, discipline, pity and protection ; his narrowness of vision, his yearning for sympathy while savagely refusing it—all these are English characteristics which Gissing had in marked degree.

A gentler nature, a more delightful companion than Gissing never existed. Both my brother and I were lazy and impish enough, yet Gissing never, during the course of two years' instruction, punished us. Once only, when, in imitation of frogs, we both chanted an Aristophanic chorus, seated on the table and declined to move or desist, did Gissing lose his patience. He rose, put on his hat, and strode in silence from the room and house. After that his every wish was, I am glad to think now, piously obeyed. As tutor he took a personal interest in both of us. Himself a good draughtsman, he

encouraged my brother's marked artistic gifts, gave him his first sketch-book and his first lessons in perspective, and drew in it a sea piece, which my brother has to this day. In those days I wrote plays, and my brother painted the scenery. On one occasion we gave a grand performance at which Gissing was present. Its reception seemed doubtful until the High Priest said :

I, a holy man, am not a fool,
Often as a boy along a pool, &c.,

which brought down the house. Gissing burst into a paroxysm of laughter, and continued laughing for fully ten minutes. All joined in ; the success of the piece was assured. He used often subsequently to quote that line, and on each occasion he would laugh and shout with glee. Gissing was very fond of whistling too—in a peculiarly low and gentle tone. His favourite air was 'Twickenham Ferry.' After nearly every lesson he had to whistle it for us, and he would always end with the words, 'Yes, it is very beautiful.' Reverential was his love for music. He has told in *Ryecroft* how the barrel organs 'tuned' his thoughts, and in a fine passage he describes how once his racked mind was quieted by the strains of a piano in Eaton Square.

Pictures and music always afforded him a keen, almost ecstatic pleasure. I have seen him sit, when my mother was playing Chopin or Bach, with tears welling in his eyes. At such moments he would remain quite motionless. The sound of music seemed to stun and soothe him. Art, all forms of beauty, influenced him strangely, physically. In one of his London lodgings he lived above a well-known composer of waltzes, who never ceased from troubling and thrumming. Yet Gissing was happy ; as he said, 'it made the words flow.'

He was extremely fond of cats. His solace and companion for some years was Grim—a big black common Tom, his lonely confidant. To Grim he would discourse aloud, of Grim he would talk to us as of an old and dear friend. When Grim one day went the way of other Toms, Gissing quite broke down, and he wrote an elegy to its memory. Gissing was no mean poet. In the summer of 1883, when my grandmother lived at Sutton Place, he used to come down three times a week to teach us in the mornings, and sometimes after luncheon he would stay and sit in the punt on the river and write poems. One of these was called *Only a Cigarette*. It was a dainty ode to a girl he had seen smoking, lazily reclining on the river-bank. He wrote, too, a powerful poem to *The Little Children*—both of which, unfortunately, I have lost. But I can see him now, sitting on the table in the long tapestried gallery at Sutton reciting verses with his voice and look of artistic enthusiasm.

Like all men of deep feeling and emotion, Gissing adored the sun and nature. Later in life, when he had shaken the dust of London for ever off his feet, he found in the contemplation of nature what

the city had never given him—peace and contentment. Of the sun he writes finely in *Ryecroft*: ‘I went bare-headed, that the golden beams of the sun might shed upon me their unstinted blessing.’ He learnt, too, the beauty of flowers; like his father, he became an enthusiastic botanist. He is speaking in *Ryecroft*:

To me flowers became symbolical of a great release, of a wonderful awakening. I recall my moments of delight, the recognition of each flower that unfolded, the surprise of budding branches clothed in a night with green. Meadows shining with buttercups, hollows sunned with the marsh marigold, held me long at gaze. I saw the willow glistening with its cones of silvery fur and splendid with dust of gold. These common things touch me with more admiration and of wonder each time I behold them. As I turn to summer, a rousing mingles with my joy.

I well remember a walk I had with Gissing about the year 1895 on the Blackdown Hill near Haslemere. The townsman I had known as a child had become a passionate lover of the country. His hair was brushed back over his forehead like a musician; he was full with the enthusiasm of old days. His knowledge of flowers and plants was extraordinary. The purple heather, the moorland waste, the sense of loneliness and expanse delighted him. He picked up a little plant and explained its life and structure with the scientific knowledge of a botanist. Every fern and wild flower stirred him to rapture and to fresh discourse.

When Gissing went with us to Bonscale in 1884 he was rampageous as any schoolboy. He would row for hours on Ullswater lake, but his great joy was the Hills. All day he would tramp, sometimes with us up Helvellyn, and sometimes alone. One walk especially I remember his taking from Patterdale to Ambleside through Rysdale to Grasmere and back over Grisedale. His great joy was to lie on his back at the top of a hill and apostrophise the cairn. And coming down he was as fleet as an Alpine guide. Sometimes we would make him play cricket; and as for climbing trees, Gissing was up at the top branch before we could get a hold of the lowest. He was strong in his arms and could climb a rope like a sailor. Killing animals, hunting, sport of all kind he abominated. But he would walk all day through any weather; he had Ruskin’s passion for hills.

Gissing was not a good conversationalist. For that he lived too much alone. He loved silence and solitude; he hated noise, the clamour of the human voice. Once we took him to a garden party at the country residence of Lady ——. Gissing sat on a chair in a corner of the room, mute and dejected. The catle and scream of idiot mirth rendered him speechless. He sat for an hour for all the world like the figure of a wet bird, amid the rustle of silk and chiffon, and never smiled till we left the house. Society unnerved him. But on the hills, or in sympathetic company, Gissing was a wonderful talker, wildly enthusiastic, suggestive, imaginative, and the words

would flow in torrents from his mouth. On Homer, Shakespeare, art and poetry, Gissing rose to flights of rhetoric. Once he had a great discussion on patriotism with the late Mlle. Souvestre. She cited the case of Henri Regnault, who returned from Algiers to fight in the Siege of Paris, as a crowning example of noble patriotism. All Gissing's artist's feelings were aflame. He would not hear of it. Regnault was an artist—art the supreme thing in life; the Siege of Paris was not worth an artist's life. I don't think Gissing had much sense of humour, and he certainly was not witty. He took himself and life too seriously; he never got out of himself, never got beyond the littleness of the great I. It was years before his mind grew mellow with the calm of dignified reflection.

In no way should *Rycroft* be regarded as an autobiography. 'The thing,' he wrote to my father, 11th of February, 1903, 'is much more an aspiration than a memory. I hope too much will not be made of the few autobiographical papers in the book.' To me it seems by far the maturest of his works, full of golden words and thoughts and fancies. His life was rounded; the end, he knew, was not far distant. 'They tell me that at my peril I shall try to live elsewhere—yet I hope to see Italy again before I die,' he wrote to me three months before his death. 'Does it seem long to you, the old days of Latin Grammar? To me, very, very long—I was strong then, and could do anything.' Gissing was no patriot in the political sense of the word; politics he hated and despised, but I doubt if any man wrote about Shakespeare and his country in words more noble than these:

Among the many reasons which make me glad to have been born in England, one of the first is that I read Shakespeare in my mother tongue. . . . Let every land have joy of its poet; for the poet is the land itself, all its greatness and its sweetness, all that incommunicable heritage for which men live and die. As I close the book, love and reverence possess me. Whether does my full heart turn to the great Enchanter, or to the Island upon which he has laid his spell? I know not. I cannot think of them apart. In the love and reverence awakened by that voice of voices, Shakespeare and England are but one.

Those who knew Gissing can never forget him. His was a life of bitter endurance, of toil and trial, of sombre tragedy. His was no vain endeavour, no mock enthusiasm. A weak vessel—a lofty intelligence, a noble mind, a sincere and beautiful nature—the words of Goethe seem fitting as an epitaph:

Wer nie sein Brod mit Tränen ass,
Wer nie die kummervollen Nächte,
Auf seinem Bette weinend sass,
Der kennt euch nicht, ihr himmlischen Mächte.

AUSTIN HARRISON.

* *Henry Rycroft*.

THE EARLY SCHOOL TEACHING OF THE JEWS

BETWEEN a nation's intellectual activity and its educational ideals some relation undoubtedly exists, although it may not be easy in all cases to discover it. The inquiries which have been made in recent years into the school systems of foreign countries testify to our belief in the connection, and prove its existence. The records of the nations of antiquity invariably tell us something about the methods adopted in the training of youth; but at best such information is scanty, and does not enable us to form any clear or definite idea of their educational aims and efforts. In the case of the ancient Jews, the task of presenting in some detail a picture of their school system is less difficult. Questions of school organisation, of educational policy, and of methods of instruction occupied, during their early history, a prominent place in the thoughts of the people, and in their voluminous literature we possess abundant material for realising their ideals.

The period of educational development to which I here refer commences some time after the Babylonian Exile. It includes the most eventful epochs of Jewish history—the birth of Christ, the siege and fall of Jerusalem—and it embraces those centuries during which the literature known as the Talmud was being formed and codified. The Talmud consists of two distinct parts: the text, which embodies the traditional or Oral Law called *Mischna*, and a running commentary supplementary to and illustrating the text, called *Gemara*. The former is in Hebrew, and the latter, for the most part, in an Aramaic dialect. The two combined constitute the Talmud, which means 'Learning,' and is the source of all our knowledge of the inner life and habits of the Jewish people, of their political and social government, of their religion and philosophy. The most superficial acquaintance with the contents of the Talmud, and a great part of it is accessible to the modern reader through translations, shows the inextinguishable love of knowledge which characterised the Hebrew people of olden times; their respect, rising to veneration, for the true scholar; their passion for learning, and the strenuous efforts and sacrifices which they made to train their children in the ways of wisdom. A life

devoted to study was regarded as the highest life ; but it did not suffice that a man should study and treasure up knowledge for his own use or enjoyment ; it was essential that he should impart it to others. ' He who studies the Law,' says the Talmud, ' without spreading it is like unto the myrtle in the desert.'

The word Law, in Hebrew *Torah*, which occurs in the passage I have quoted and constantly in all Hebrew writings, has a very wide meaning in Jewish literature. Originally, no doubt, it meant the Law of Moses, or possibly the ordinances contained in the Book of Deuteronomy. But gradually it came to mean much more than this. It included at a very early period of history, probably before the time of Ezra, and certainly then, a number of traditional enactments and sayings, known as the Oral Law, which were supposed to have the same authority as the Pentateuch, and which were first committed to writing towards the end of the second century under the direction of Rabbi Judah the Prince. The word *Torah* became a synonym for lore or learning, embracing both literature and dogma, the discursive histories and parables of the people as well as their legal enactments. The one class of writings was known as *Hagadah* and the other as *Halacha*. Much in the same sense as our own word 'Law' has a double meaning, expressing the ordinances of the State and the sequences of natural phenomena, so the word *Torah* was applied to the Biblical and traditional statutes as well as to the established order of the Universe, both of which were regarded as equally divine.

It is very necessary to understand this extended meaning of the word 'Law,' as it was used in olden times, in order to appreciate the true significance of the many Biblical and Talmudic passages in which it occurs, particularly in relation to the value of knowledge and the importance which, from the earliest times, the Hebrew people attached to the education of the young and to the pursuit of learning for its own sake. Scattered throughout the Talmudic writings are detailed regulations on school organisation, on the subjects and methods of instruction, and on the qualifications of teachers ; but all these are closely associated with the general aim and purpose of study and school training, which was no other than right living, that is, living according to the Law, in the sense in which the word was then used. Learning, although it came to be regarded as the primary aim of life, was in reality a secondary or mediate end, the final object being right conduct, to which such knowledge as was then accessible was the only sure and safe guide. The saying *non scholæ sed vitæ discimus* occurs, variously paraphrased, in many parts of the Talmud. Far weightier, we are told, is the fulfilment than the study of the Law. And elsewhere, ' Not learning but doing is the real essential.'

It is to the Bible that we must look for the origin of the school methods and educational ideals which we find more fully developed in post-Biblical literature. Indeed, the text of the Bible was the

ultimate authority for all State regulations and social ordinances, although much casuistry was frequently displayed in the endeavour to reconcile the Biblical text with the necessities and requirements of everyday life. To the Bible, however, we can trace the germ of the system of education, which was in no way altered, but was only further developed, in later times. Home training was the central idea of the system. This is very fully expressed and illustrated in the Mosaic precept which occurs in the passage declaratory of Israel's faith in the unity of God. 'These words thou shalt teach diligently to thy children, and shalt speak of them when thou sittest in thy house, when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down and when thou risest up.' A whole volume of pedagogic rules might be deduced from these words. They clearly show that in very early times the obligation was thrown upon parents to personally direct the education of their children, and that religious training was an essential part of home instruction.

The Exile into which the Jews were driven after the destruction of the first Temple influenced in many ways the character and history of the people; but in none more so than by proving that Judaism might continue to exist outside the Promised Land and deprived of the Temple service. This new conception of the religion directed the energies of the people more and more to the study of the Law, and helped very much to develop and to systematise their educational efforts. During their fifty years of Captivity, the Jews came into close communion with men distinguished by a culture very different from their own, and they brought away with them new ideas and a new knowledge, which exercised a permanent influence on their subsequent intellectual activity.

Between the return of the Jews from Babylon and the destruction of the second Temple, great progress was made in the organisation, throughout Palestine, of schools for Jewish youth. The schools first established were intended for children who had received their elementary training in their own homes, and were prepared to enter upon a higher course of instruction. About the year 80 B.C. Simon ben Schetach directed that academies, or, as we should call them, secondary schools, should be established in all large towns, and the organisation which he succeeded in effecting anticipated, in many particulars, subsequent efforts of the same kind. Something similar is sketched by John Milton in his essay on a *Free Commonwealth*. Milton proposed that every county in the land should be 'made a kind of subordinate commonalty or commonwealth,' and further, that the people should have 'schools and academies at their own choice, wherein their children may be bred up in their own sight to all learning and noble education; not in grammar only, but in all liberal arts and exercises'; and he tells us that such schools 'would soon spread much more knowledge and civility, yea religion, throughout all parts

of the land.' To what extent Milton in this proposal anticipated the legislation of 1902, without any premonition of the difficulties in the working of the Act which have recently been experienced, is a question full of interest. But far more interesting is the thought that a Jewish Rabbi, nearly twenty centuries ago, succeeded in establishing, without opposition, and with the full sympathy of the nation, in all the chief towns of Palestine, high schools not very different in purpose from those which our English poet contemplated, and by an order having the same object in view as an Act of Parliament.

It was gradually found, however, when the opportunities for higher education were attracting numerous aspirants, that a more generous elementary training was needed. Indeed, the conditions would appear to have been then not very different from now, and about a century later, just before the destruction of the Temple, Joshua ben Gamala, a high priest, whose name the Talmud says should always be mentioned with a blessing, appointed teachers in the several provinces and towns, charged with the duty of seeing that all children from six years old and upwards, who could not be taught in their own homes, should receive school instruction.

The crisis in the history of the Jews which followed so closely on the promulgation of this important ordinance withdrew for some time the thoughts of the people from questions of educational reform. The dire necessities of the great siege blocked the way. But it was not long after the people had settled down to the new conditions, under a stricter Roman rule, that the scheme of the great reformer was, so far as circumstances permitted, generally adopted. A passion for the study of the Law seized upon the people. It was shared almost equally by the two great political parties into which they were divided. In different ways the Sadducees and the Pharisees vied with one another in their zeal for the study of the sacred writings and the observance of the Law, interpreting, however, somewhat differently its meaning and significance. From this time the feeling of patriotism which love of country arouses was intensified a hundredfold among the Jews in their pride of belief and in their sense of responsibility, which, as guardians of the Law, bound them together as one people.

There were Jews in Palestine who continued to cherish the hope of freeing themselves from the Roman yoke, and the revolt under Bar Cochba and the martyrdom of Akiba testify to the strength of this desire. But others, with almost prophetic vision, foresaw the dispersion of the race, and to their efforts is undoubtedly due the survival of Judaism. It may be truly said that the Jewish School grew up on the ruins of the Temple. It became the means of preserving the national existence. Its aim transcended the ordinary purposes of education. Its object was not so much the care and instruction of the children as the preservation of the nation. The training of students was a means to that end. But the end was national rather

than individual. The School was the sole means left to a proud people of maintaining their existence, of holding on to their inheritance. What compulsory military service became later on to other nations, compulsory school attendance was to the Jews. In the war which they waged against ignorance and indifference, the School was their fortress. In the field of learning, which they cultivated with the same patience and patriotism as they had displayed in the defence of their citadel, the School was their national emblem. It is only by realising how the survival of the race came to be identified with the preservation and observance of the Law, and how the study of the Law was essential to its interpretation, that we can understand the devotion of a people, nearly two thousand years ago, to school work in all its seemingly uninteresting details, and the reverential regard and esteem in which the school teacher was held.

An effort of imagination is necessary in order that we may grasp the inner meaning of many of the sayings of Talmudic scholars, and appreciate the spirit that dictated them. We read, for instance, that several learned men were commissioned to visit different parts of Palestine and to establish schools where needed. Having entered a town where no school existed, they inquired for the guardians or protectors of the city. When the civic councillors were brought before them, they said, 'These are not the protectors of the town.' 'Who are they then?' asked the citizens, and the reply they received was, 'The protectors of the town are the teachers of the children.'

A celebrated teacher, Rabbi ben Jochai, said, 'When you see that towns in Palestine have fallen from their status, know that they have failed to support the scribes and school teachers.' The law as to the appointment of teachers in a town was very drastic. By a decree of the Patriarch Judah the Second, 'the town which refused to appoint a teacher for the children was to be destroyed.'

It is significant that when the fall of Jerusalem was imminent, and rebellion was rampant within its walls, when the zealots who preached resistance *à outrance* guarded the exits, and put to death all who spoke of surrender, Rabbi Jochanan ben Zaccai, the most renowned teacher of his time, persuaded his disciples to carry him in his coffin, as though dead, to the camp of Titus. With difficulty, he was conveyed through the zealously-guarded gates; but he succeeded in escaping, and when brought before the Roman general he made a request which appeared so simple, so much in harmony with his well-known character, that it was at once granted. He asked only that he might be permitted to establish a school at Jamnia, and there pursue his studies with a few of his chosen disciples. The request was granted, but Titus could not have foreseen that, in acceding to the Rabbi's wish, he had really allowed the garrison to depart with all the honours of war, carrying with them their arms and ammunition. Yet so it was. For he had permitted the actual embodiment of

Jewish learning to re-establish itself in a new centre. The Temple and all that Jerusalem represented were, in fact, nothing more than the shell of Judaism. • The Law went forth to Jamnia, to be there preserved and to be thence spread to all parts of the civilised world.

It was a common belief during the centuries that immediately followed the fall of Jerusalem that the city was destroyed because the schools had been closed, and it was subsequently held that the instruction of children must not be interrupted, even for the rebuilding of the Temple. It is distinctly stated in the Talmud that it was not permitted to live in a town where there was neither teacher nor school. Nearly nineteen centuries ago, Josephus wrote, 'Our principal care of all is this, to educate our children well.' The Law ordains 'that the very beginning of our education shall be directed to sobriety. It also commands us to bring up our children in learning, and to exercise them in the Laws and to make them acquainted with the acts of their predecessors, in order that, through imitation of them, they may be nourished up in the Laws from infancy, and may neither transgress them nor have any pretence for ignorance of them.' One of the best known sayings of the Talmud, full of deep meaning and indicating the keenest possible appreciation of the value of education, attributed to Rabbi Eliezer ben Shamna, is, 'By the breath from the mouth of school children the world is sustained.' It was he, too, who is said to have interpreted the words of the Psalmist, 'Touch not my anointed,' as referring to school children, and the words, 'Do not offend my prophets,' to their teachers.

The position occupied by school teachers in Talmudic times is in striking contrast to their status in the days of ancient Greece or Rome. Professor Mahaffy, writing on old Greek education, says: 'The Greek schoolmaster, at least of elementary schools, was not generally in high repute, . . . and his calling was not such as to give him either dignity or self-respect.' And he quotes from a passage in Demosthenes' *De Corona*: 'But you, worthy man, who despise others compared with yourself, now compare with mine your own lot, which consigned you to grow up from boyhood in the greatest need, when you helped your father to attend in the school, preparing the ink, cleaning the benches, sweeping out the schoolroom, and so taking the rank of a slave, and not of a free boy.' It was not to slaves, but to the choice and master spirits among the people, that the training of Jewish children was entrusted. Respect for the teacher was inculcated as even a higher duty than filial piety. 'If both father and teacher are threatened, the latter,' we are told, 'should be first protected.' This reverence for the teacher was only the necessary corollary of the sanctification of learning. Nowadays the whole civilised world is beginning to grasp the fact that the material prosperity of a people depends upon the extent and standard of their educational equipment. We are told that it was the school-

master who gained for Prussia the victories by which the Empire of Germany was established; and certainly no one will question the fact that we must look to the schoolmaster for the remarkable successes, not only in war, but in all the arts of peace, which have won for Japan a front place among the civilised nations of the world. History, however, shows nothing more suggestive than the fact that the people who gave to the world the Book should have shown throughout the whole of their national existence, and long surviving it, a love of learning in all its branches, and the keenest desire to extend it.

The aim of education among the Jews was national rather than individual. They believed that in the success of their schools lay all hope of preserving and promoting the study of the Law, which was their inheritance, and of thus fulfilling the purpose of their existence. 'Children are born,' says Erasmus, 'for the State and for God,' a doctrine as old as Plato, but in no country were its consequences so unreservedly accepted as in Palestine. Nothing is more characteristic of the Jews than their devotion to study, but very little thought was given to what we are always being told should be the practical results of school training. The function of the schools was not to teach what might be even indirectly helpful in the pursuit of trade or commerce, or in fitting men 'to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war.' The aim of education was rather what Milton describes as the true end of learning—'to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love Him, to imitate Him, to be like Him.' The Jews, believing that their national existence could be preserved only through knowledge of the Law, regarded learning as an end in itself. There was no thought, as now, of the application of knowledge to this or that particular pursuit. There was no distinction between pure and applied science. There were no schools of commerce, and technology was unknown. The Law was studied for its own sake. The quest for knowledge was a religious duty, and its possession was the highest good.

As a consequence, the honours which in all countries have been lavished on the soldier, as the emblem and instrument of national defence, were bestowed, in Palestine, on the teacher. The analogy goes further; for whilst the soldier in all countries is generally ill-paid, content with the honour and glory which he may hope to achieve and the prestige of his position, the teacher in Palestine was content to be unpaid. The recompense of his work was its result. We find, therefore, that the Rabbis of old were engaged in all kinds of handicraft. One was a mason, another a carpenter, Hillel was a hewer of wood, and so on. And, in order that the career of a teacher might be open to all, it was incumbent on every parent to teach his child a trade. Manual labour was therefore dignified. 'Great is the virtue of handwork,' says the Talmud; 'it honoureth those who

devote themselves to it,' a sentiment the value of which our schools are only now beginning to appreciate. Maimonides, writing on the subject in the twelfth century, says: 'We do not find anywhere a Rabbi complaining that his contemporaries have bestowed upon him no possessions. They set their entire trust in God and in the Law, through which alone man can attain to happiness. They refuse to accept any gift, for by so doing it might be thought that the study and teaching of the Law was a practice by means of which man gained a living.' It is recorded in more than one instance that a wife voluntarily separated herself from her husband, who, late in life, desired to take up the teacher's calling in order that he might apply himself heart and soul to learning, rejoining him only when he had become a Rabbi.

That learning was an end in itself, to be pursued without any thought of ulterior advancement, was the ideal held up to the Jewish people. 'Make not the study of the Law the means of self-aggrandisement,' says Rabbi Zadok; 'neither make it a crown to shine with, nor a spade to dig with.' There is another saying, which bids one 'study the Law, even when not for its own sake, for, be the object what it may, you will come to study it for its own sake'—a wise and pithy saying, constantly illustrated in our own schools, when a man takes up a study as a bread-and-butter pursuit, and is so attracted by it that he becomes an independent seeker after truth.

The loftiness of this ideal is heightened when we remember that it was through learning only that one could aspire to a seat in the Sanhedrin, which was the governing body of the people, and that to be admitted a member of that body was the worthy ambition of every scholar. The title Rabbi, which means only 'Master,' was the equivalent of our 'doctorate.' It was conferred only after many years of patient study, and carried with it, like the title 'artium magister,' centuries later, the privilege of teaching and of founding a school. The fame of any celebrated teacher spread then, as in the early part of the Middle Ages, and many a Rabbi, like Abelard, later on, attracted students in great numbers from very distant places. There was no necessary connection between the Rabbi and the priest. On the contrary, the Rabbis were often in conflict with the political influence of the priesthood. The priests were essentially servants of the Temple. In the preservation of the Temple services their interests and hopes were centred. Not so the Rabbis. Their outlook was wider. Their citadel was the Law, which, as time went on, they protected with hedges as defensive as the wire entanglements of modern strategists. At the same time they prepared the way for the permanent survival of Judaism, and for rendering its existence independent of the possession of Palestine or the restoration of the Temple. This was the great work which their schools accomplished.

Something must be now said of Jewish pedagogy, of the subjects of instruction, and of the methods of teaching in these old schools. The Hebrew Scriptures and the Talmud, consisting of the Mischna or Oral Law and its interpretation, were the common subjects of school instruction. The substance of the Talmud, which during this period was unwritten and constantly gathering to itself new matter, was the subject of study in the Jewish academies or high schools. It occupied the place of the classics in the schools of mediæval Europe, and, indeed, in schools of very recent times.

The obligatory school age commenced at six. Many sayings have come down to us showing the importance which was attached to early training. 'The quest of knowledge in old age is like drawing on sand, in youth like engraving on stone;' and elsewhere: 'If you have not desired knowledge when young, how can you attain to it in after-life?' These and many similar sayings found in the Talmud express the common belief of the people in those far-off days. In the elementary schools a teacher was appointed to every twenty-five pupils, the regulation number of a class. If it was found necessary to include forty children, an assistant-teacher was added. The morning and part of the evening were devoted to instruction. Under no circumstances, not even on occasions of great national sorrow, might the school be closed. There were holidays, but they were few. Even on the Sabbath the school was open, but the teaching was restricted to repetition. No new subject was begun. Punctuality in attendance was enforced. Raschi, the great commentator, quotes an old rule: 'Give your pupils a fixed time for coming and leaving.' Thoroughness was the great principle on which teachers insisted. The old rule, *Non multa sed multum*, was anticipated by the Rabbins. 'Better a little with attention than much superficially.' 'A single subject mastered with difficulty is better than a hundred hastily acquired.' At the same time teachers recognised the value of 'short cuts' when they were equally efficient. 'In teaching, always choose the shorter road.'

The secret of discipline was interest: the interest aroused in the study, and, above all, the interest of parents in what their children were learning. The sympathy of the parents with the efforts of the schoolmaster made his task a pleasure, and instruction easy. Learning by heart formed a large part of the teaching both in the elementary and higher schools. That was necessarily so when the instruction was mainly oral. At the same time reading was generally taught, and the Hebrew language was systematically studied. Many mnemonic rules are given in the Talmud for assisting the memory, but constant repetition was considered the surest method, and in this respect the teaching was very similar to that of comparatively modern times. The Latin rule, *Repetitio mater est studiorum*, is otherwise figuratively expressed in the saying: 'He who studies without repeating is like

the 'man who sows and does not reap.' And elsewhere: 'He who repeats a matter a hundred times does not understand it as well as he who repeats it a hundred and one times.' In an age when there were no publishers, and consequently no text-books, it was necessary that the pupil should first fix in his memory the subject of the lesson and then seek to understand it. Hence we find the saying, 'First know the matter and then learn to explain it,' an analytical principle of teaching of wider application than it probably received in the Talmudic schools. 'Knowledge is gained,' says the Talmud, 'by help of the memory.' But from a comparatively early age the pupil was trained in methods of inquiry, and was encouraged to ask questions. The fault that prevailed for so many years in modern colleges, where the teacher talked and the student listened, was unknown in Talmudic seminaries. The instruction was much more lively. There was a constant and brisk interchange of thought between teacher and pupil. Writing on the subject of these schools in 1885, Strassburger, a German author, tells us that 'the method of instruction was strictly *heuristic*.' He may not have used the word exactly as it is now applied to the teaching of elementary science, but he did mean that the pupil was expected to elicit by pertinent questions and investigation the meaning of what was to him obscure. 'The bashful pupil learns nothing,' we are told in the Talmud, and it was expressly forbidden to appear to understand any matter the meaning of which was not clear to him. Even if his instructor grew impatient, he was told that he should excuse himself by saying: 'I ask for further explanation because my powers of apprehension are weak.'

Whilst the habit of inquiry was thus generally encouraged and cultivated, modesty as to his own knowledge and ability, and respect for that of his teacher, were the two virtues which students were trained to practise. 'Teach your tongue to say, I know not,' is a trite Talmudic precept; and it is also said, 'If you know much, do not pride yourself on your knowledge, for thereto you were created.' Children were taught the doctrine that kindly action follows increased intelligence and understanding, and the connection which the Talmud establishes between knowledge and right-conduct is sufficiently pronounced to satisfy the most faithful disciple of Herbart. Hillel goes so far as to say, 'A boor cannot be sin-fearing, nor a rustic a saint,' and the penalty of confirmed sinfulness was exclusion from the schools. 'You shall not instruct,' says the Talmud, 'a worthless pupil.'

Under such a system very high qualifications were required from the teachers. The fittest age for a teacher was much discussed, and as a general rule no one was considered qualified to teach under forty years of age. To this rule, however, there were many and frequent exceptions, and a certain Rabbi counselled, 'Do not look at the vessel, but at its contents, for we find new vessels with old

wine, and old vessels with new wine.' As morality and learning were closely associated in old Jewish culture, the moral attributes of the teacher were the qualifications which were first considered. It was only the pure-minded and the clean-handed who could be entrusted with the sacred duty of teaching the young. The Talmud gives a very long list of qualifications which the teacher should possess, very few of which our examination system would be able to test. He should be slow to anger, courteous in his language, free from conceit, loving criticism and not exalted by his knowledge, sedate in study, widely observant, eager to extend knowledge and to make others learn; above all, he must be God-fearing and free from worldly ambition. There were no training colleges in those days; the teacher learned the art of teaching by studying the methods of his master.

The school buildings were generally outside the town, away from the busy hum of men. During the lesson the children sat on the floor in a half-circle, and the teacher on a raised seat in the centre. The schoolhouse and synagogue were often in the same building, and, even to the present day, the house of prayer is known in Germany as *Schule* and in Italy as *Scuola*. Indeed, in olden times the training of the home, of the school, and of the synagogue were one and the same. The distinction between religious and secular instruction was unknown. In the impressive words of a German writer: 'As the child went forth each morning from his father's house into the synagogue and thence into the seminary, he went from one house of God into another, and one Book and one Spirit accompanied him, whether at home, in school, or in the house of prayer.'

In the higher schools or academies, the voluminous literature known as Talmud embraced the various subjects of instruction. These, however, were not studied separately according to any pre-arranged syllabus, but incidentally as they arose, and 'as they were required to elucidate the Biblical text or the traditional precept. The most superficial acquaintance with the contents of this great work, in the form in which we now have it, shows how numerous were the avenues it opened up to the study of the science and philosophy of the day. The discussions which occupy a large part of the work traverse vast fields of inquiry, including much of what was then known of physiology and medicine, of astronomy, law, history, and grammar. The search into the inner meaning of every line and word in the Biblical writings, the investigation into the why and wherefore of every legal enactment, and the honest endeavour to adapt the written and traditional ordinances to the varying requirements of life, led the patient student to follow any track that promised wider knowledge, and enabled him, in many cases, to strike out new paths as the result of independent thought and research. 'It is impossible,' says the Talmud, 'to frequent the academy without discovering something new'—a sentence showing that it was

the duty of the teachers not only to impart acquired knowledge, but also to stimulate inquiry into new regions of thought. The two Buxtorfs, father and son, who are accounted among the most learned of Christian writers on the Talmud, bear testimony to the width and variety of its contents. 'The Talmud,' we are told, 'is in itself a great body of learning, and contains many-sided references to all branches of science'; and the younger Buxtorf, in the introduction to his well-known Lexicon, speaks of the 'legal, medical, ethical, political, and astronomical dissertations' which are found in its pages.

If we consider for a moment the varied and intricate questions which necessarily arose in deducing from the Bible and the Mishna a practical code of ordinances to govern every detail in human life, we shall realise how many so-called secular subjects of study were called into requisition in the arguments for and against any judgment or decision. Take the laws for the killing of animals for human food, which recently occupied the attention of the Admiralty Committee. The report of that Committee was necessarily largely influenced by the evidence of two of our best known physiologists. The discussions of the members of the Committee were of the same order of thought as those of the Jewish scholars 2,000 years ago, and, although the conclusions may not be identical, the investigations were carried on in a like scientific spirit and with the same humanitarian object in view. Questions of anatomy were frequent subjects of inquiry in the Talmudic schools. Whether the hare, for instance, can be classed among ruminants was a matter on which difference of opinion prevailed. In the Bible it is so classified, and on that ground alone would have been considered clean and edible. But, as the hoof is undivided, it was forbidden as an article of food. When the Bible was translated into Greek the newer learning went to show that the hare *did not* chew the cud, and the Septuagint Jewish writers gave both reasons for its being forbidden and boldly inserted the negative, thus altering the original text. If we consider the searching character of the investigation which alone could have justified such an alteration¹ we shall realise how extended was the field of knowledge in which the old Jewish teachers worked.

Then, again, the settling of the Calendar with a view to the accurate determination of the dates of the Festivals and Feasts necessitated a wide acquaintance with astronomical science. According to the Talmud, the Israelite who aspired to be ranked among the wise was bound to study mathematics and astronomy. It was said of one of the Rabbis that 'the paths of the heavenly bodies were

¹ In the LXX. version of Lev. xi. 6, which runs as follows: *καὶ τὸν χοιρογρύλλιον, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνάγει μηρυκισμὸν τοῦτο καὶ ὅπλην οὐ διχλήει, ἀκάθαρτον τοῦτο ὑμῖν*, the negative *οὐκ* is inserted in the text, and the conjunctive *καὶ* is substituted for the disjunctive 'but.' 'And the hare, because he choweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof, he is unclean to you.'

as familiar to him as the streets of his native town.' 'Astronomy and Geometry,' according to the Mishna, 'are the ornaments of wisdom.' The Talmud consists largely of dissertations on historical, legal, and scientific questions, and these formed the subject-matter of discussions in the schools. The method of training was in the highest degree disciplinary. It served to sharpen the wits and to develop the intelligence of the students in a manner and to a degree that have never been surpassed. It had many of the merits of the Socratic method, but dealt with matters of wider interest to the welfare of the community. The subjects of inquiry led the student into fields of investigation and research which included the entire area of the science of the day. It embraced Persian, Greek, and Roman lore. For a period of more than 500 years, the Talmudists were prominent among the most earnest searchers after truth; and it was unquestionably due to the collateral study involved in the interpretation of difficult passages in the written and Oral Law that their descendants occupied so distinguished a position among the philosophers and physicians of the early Middle Ages.

The tendency of modern educational thought and policy in certain directions is not so far removed from the ideals of the old Talmudic fathers. Year by year, and very rapidly in the last few years, the belief is growing and maturing that the salvation of a people is their school training. For the successful discharge of every duty in life—for the attainment of all those ends which to the modern world are dear—education has come to be regarded not only as necessary but indispensable. What kind of education is best adapted to different purposes, to the making of men and women, is a question—or is a consideration involving questions, for they are many—of the greatest concern and of the deepest interest. But everyone is agreed that the training of the young is a matter of national importance, demanding the active thought, the financial aid, and the careful supervision of the State. With this recognition of the national aims of education, has grown up, or is growing up, a truer appreciation of the position and authority of the teacher. It is because there has been lacking in this country that enthusiasm for education, that belief in its saving and constructive influence, that respect for the teacher, which distinguished the ancient Jews, that we have been falling behind in many walks of life, and have now to devote our energies to the remedying of our defects. But the last quarter of a century has witnessed a great change. We are impressed by the fact that from the lecture-rooms and laboratories of our professors go forth discoveries and laws, which modify the whole course of human life in all its tangled and varied efforts, and we see with satisfaction that honours are bestowed with no sparing hand upon those who have helped to push back the barriers of the unknown, or have rendered the wisdom sown of ages more generally available. The

respect and esteem in which the Rabbi was held in Talmudic days is being gradually extended to the schoolmaster and to the professor of modern times. Slowly but certainly we are coming to regard the schools of the people as the nation's strongholds, and to see in their efficiency the country's real strength and civilising power. This ideal was ever present to the minds of the Jewish sages whose wisdom is recorded in the pages of the Talmud. . . .

Perhaps, too, we may come in time to recognise as they did—and many present conflicts will then have ceased—that all knowledge is divine, that science and religion are one, or, as the Talmud tersely expresses it : ' Truth is the seal of God.' .

PHILIP MAGNUS.

THE LORDS AND THE EDUCATION BILL

THERE can be no doubt that when the Lords have completed their consideration of the Education Bill in Committee a situation will have arisen which will require very careful handling indeed if a political crisis is to be averted. The Liberal majority in the Commons is young, eager, and intensely Radical. Already it has had one or two small brushes with the Lords. And the temper it displayed on those comparatively insignificant occasions shows that it will need all 'C.-B.'s' wonderful control over his followers to keep them steady when face to face with the Lords' amendments to their Education Bill.

That the Lords will make drastic amendments the Second Reading speeches of the Primate and the Duke of Devonshire leave no shadow of doubt. And, in passing, let me clear up a fatal confusion of thought into which the Primate fell in the speech under reference, and to which Mr. Balfour is persistently addicted. These good people say: 'Here are the Church schools, built, to a large extent at any rate, with moneys subscribed by Church people in order that children may receive Church teaching. *Isn't it grossly tyrannical and a cruel breach of faith now to divert these schools from their original purpose and turn them into Provided schools in which undenominational religious teaching only can be given as part of the State provision?*' (Of course the Bill offers 'facilities' either on two days a week or on every day in the week for specific Church teaching; but as this is no part of the public provision of education, and is at the expense of the denominationalists themselves, they decline to connote the fact in stating their argument.)

Now, in order properly to examine this the main charge against the Government Bill, I must, like Dr. Davidson, indulge in a short retrospect. Down to 1870 primary education was conducted by voluntary agencies aided by Exchequer grants. These grants were fixed, at that time, at any rate, at such a level as to necessitate the raising of a substantial sum per child by way of local voluntary contributions. And it was these voluntary contributions which were held to justify the giving—over and above the secular teaching paid for by the Government grants—of denominational religious teaching. When Parliament came to review the situation in 1870, it was seen

that, even when aided by very large Exchequer grants, the voluntary system was wholly inadequate to meet the needs of the nation. So Parliament passed the Act of 1870. What did that Act achieve exactly? It said to the managers of the denominational schools: 'You will go on receiving State grants; your schools will remain under private management; you will continue to give denominational teaching; but you will also have to continue to collect a substantial portion of your income by means of voluntary contributions.' (Indeed, so generously did the Act of 1870 treat the denominationalists that whilst their schools accommodated 1,800,000 children in 1870, by 1900 they were accommodating 3,000,000.) But the Act of 1870 went further. It said: 'Clearly the voluntary system is not adequate to meet our demands. It must be supplemented. We will, therefore, give every locality the power to elect *ad hoc* a local Board of Education—a School Board. The first duty of this School Board will be to survey the area of its administration, and if it finds a deficiency in school accommodation it shall build an elementary school to be directly under its control. This school we will style a Board school. It shall get Government grants just like the denominational school; but, unlike that school, it shall not be called upon to collect its local income from the pockets of voluntary subscribers. It shall make up any deficiency in its school fund after the receipt of the Government grant as a charge upon the local rates. But,' continued the Act of 1870, 'in consideration of this aid from the rates this new type of school must conform to two vital conditions: (1) It must be fully under local public control, and (2) if any religious teaching be given in it, that religious teaching must not include any formulary or tenet distinctive of any particular denomination.'

Very good. The new Board schools thus started alongside the older denominational system flourished amazingly. By 1900 they were accommodating, roughly, 3,000,000 children. Thus at that date half the working-class children were in attendance at one type of school and half at the other. But as the years had gone on between 1870 and 1900 the strain on the denominational system had become increasingly acute. With the very natural zeal of the religionists their directors had striven with night and main to extend their area of operations; and so successful were they in this perfectly understandable endeavour that, as I have said, by 1900 they were essaying the task of educating nearly twice as many youngsters as in 1870, with the inevitable result that they were giving to surface what should have been devoted to depth. And in competition with the rate-aided Board school the struggle for existence became increasingly difficult. If Mr. Balfour had not come to their rescue in 1902, four-fifths of them would by to-day have passed into the hands of the School Boards. And where, let me ask the Primate and Mr. Balfour, would denominational teaching have been then?

However, in 1902 Mr. Balfour, recognising that the great majority of the denominational schools were *in extremis*, came to their rescue with his Bill of that year. What was wanted was more money. Had there been any in the central Exchequer he would doubtless have proposed a new big Special Aid grant. But the South African war had emptied the State coffers; so there was nothing for it but to let the denominational school drift painfully and rapidly out of existence altogether, or put it on the rates. The latter was a desperate expedient. It involved all sorts of nasty conditions, and would probably be fatal in the long run to the system. The late Primate wrung his hands and warned his people of the cataclysm which would await the close of their short and swift existence upon 'the slippery slope of the rates.' However, *faute de mieux*, on the rates they went.

Now the reader will begin to see the reason for my retrospect. What were the prime conditions laid down in 1870 under which alone a school could receive rate aid? (And remember these conditions were acquiesced in by all parties, Tories and Liberals, Churchmen and chapel-goers.) They were, as I have said: (1) Full local control; (2) no denominational teaching as part of the public provision of education.

When Dr. Davidson, therefore, stands at the table of the House of Lords and talks about Clause I. of the Government Bill—under which all rate-aided schools become 'Provided' or Board schools—as constituting a gross breach of faith, his jeremiads are belated. They ought to have been delivered exactly four years ago. They ought to have been directed against Mr. Balfour, and not against Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. And they ought to have taken this form: 'Thank you very much; but we dare not put our schools on the rates because that will involve fundamental changes in the conduct of our schools in which we are not prepared to acquiesce.' The good Archbishop wants to eat his cake in 1902 and still have it in 1906!

And Mr. Balfour, who is far more subtle than the Primate, constantly looks across to the Liberal benches and with well-affected innocence asks, 'What grievance did my Act of 1902 impose upon Nonconformists? Did I not free all the teachers, save the head teachers, from anything in the nature of a religious test? Did I not give the municipal authorities full control of all the finances of the denominational school? Did I not abolish "the one-man manager"? Did I not associate with him in the management of the denominational school five other persons, two of whom are representatives of the public?' Often and often have I smiled to see the gloom, and even consternation, these perfectly true statements have caused to spread over the countenances of the stern and unbending Nonconformists of the Liberal benches! But the fact is Mr. Balfour, with Oriental ingenuity, entirely begs the question. The question he should ask himself is this: 'Having put these schools on the rates, did I make

them conform to the conditions laid down by common consent in 1870 as essential to the receipt of rate aid?'. Put this way the answer would be much more embarrassing to the right hon. gentleman.

This is a long digression from a consideration of the problem of what will happen when the Lords have done with the Government Bill. But, after all, it is necessary to a proper understanding of the situation, because, whatever the Government may agree to in December next, it cannot possibly accept any amendment which (1) vitiates in any degree whatsoever the policy of complete local control; (2) imposes a religious test upon any teacher upon appointment; and (3) provides for the giving of denominational religious teaching at the public expense, and as part of the provision by the local education authority of public elementary education.

These matters are definitely barred. The emphatic pledges given by Liberals last January make this much quite clear. Therefore their Lordships had better understand at once that any attempt to modify the Bill in such a way as to contravene these three propositions will simply mean trouble.

At the same time, I do not deny that quite outside these matters several important alterations of the Bill are possible. There is the question of the old Clause VI., now Clause VII. That Clause laid it down for the first time in English educational history that a parent need not send his child to school till the close of the religious lesson. This may be knocked out by the Lords, and I suppose not very many of us in the Commons will shed many tears. There will still remain the rather invidious 'Conscience Clause' of 1870, under which the child must come to school at the formal opening and thereafter either receive religious instruction or stand aside to receive secular instruction. This has recently been amplified by the 'Anson' by-law, which, wherever a local education authority cares to adopt it, sets up by by-law substantially what Mr. Birrell proposed to enact by statute. So, after all, Clause VII. may go without much pother, though I for one shall regret its disappearance.

Then comes 'the silencing of the voice of the teacher,' as Dr. Davidson cleverly put it months ago. In the cases of all transferred denominational schools which do not apply for 'extended facilities,' the Bill proposes that the State teacher should not be allowed to volunteer to give the denominational teaching provided for under the ordinary facilities plan on two mornings a week. This has been put into the Bill to prevent a religious test being applied to the teacher on appointment. For myself, I have all along suggested that a compromise might be effected by allowing the existing teachers who have in the past given denominational teaching to continue to do so if they care to volunteer. For undoubtedly very many of them, and especially the women, consider it a grave hardship to be now deprived of

a duty which has been to them in the past a real pleasure and a genuine satisfaction. Further, I fancy that my friends who fear a test if the teacher be allowed to volunteer do not quite project their minds into the working of the new machinery for the local control of the schools and the teachers to be set up under the Bill if and when it passes into law. To-day the person who would ask the teacher to volunteer would be able as a manager vitally to affect his appointment. To-morrow that same person would have no right whatever as a manager to put any such question to the teacher. And if he did the teacher would at once apply in protest to the local education authority. Besides there is always the National Union of Teachers. That powerful, often maligned, and very much misunderstood organisation, to which the country owes a good deal more of educational reform than it is ever likely to acknowledge, may very well be left to see that no injustice befalls the teacher.

One other point before I leave the teacher. Clause VIII., Sub-section 2, reads as follows : 'A teacher employed in a public elementary school shall not be required as part of his duties as teacher to give any religious instruction, and shall not be required as a condition of his appointment to subscribe to any religious creed, or to attend or abstain from attending any Sunday school or place of religious worship.' I sincerely hope no attempt will be made to tamper with this sub-section. To religionists it provides for the first time an assurance that the teacher who does not believe shall be freed without prejudice from the most odious task of imparting to little children religious truths about which he himself may be sceptical. To the teachers it is a most timely and grateful Conscience Clause. To the vast multitude of teachers it will make no difference whatever ; to a very few it may be an unspeakable relief.

Then there comes the problem of Clause IV., an extension of the principles of the settlement of 1870 wholly gratuitous from the point of view of Liberalism, and wholly made in the interests of the denominationalists, who, by the way, have been the reverse of grateful for what Mr. Birrell has, in the teeth of much Liberal irritation, attempted on their behalf. The four-fifths of Clause IV. may be reduced by the Lords to three-fourths or something of that sort. I hope not. Unless the parents of four-fifths of the children attending a school can be found willing to ballot for 'extended facilities,' it is clear that the school does not represent that homogeneous family the existence of which can alone justify the special arrangements for religious teaching of a denominational character provided for in the clause.

Again, there is the proscription limiting the application of the clause to urban areas with populations of over 5,000. 'This is very much resented by the denominationalists, and may be thrown out by the Lords. I do not think there is anything very terrible in this, because the clause elsewhere provides that 'extended facilities' can

only be granted if there is a sufficiency of Cowper-Temple school accommodation within easy access of the children whose parents do not desire the form of special religious teaching provided under the scheme of 'extended facilities.' Therefore this amendment would not cause me personally any sleepless nights.

Finally there is the suggestion that the clause should be made 'mandatory.' This, so far as the duty of the Local Education Authority to furnish the 'extended facilities' demanded is concerned, is a reasonable demand which I have all along supported—not indeed as involving any matter of high policy, but purely in the interests of administrative harmony. However, the Government has conceded an appeal to the Board of Education on the point, so there is not much left in the demand for turning the first 'may' of the clause into 'shall.' But the proposal to make the clause 'mandatory,' so far as the teachers are concerned, is quite out of the question. To make the second 'may' of the clause into 'shall' would involve a direct denominational test upon the teachers; and this the Cabinet is bound to oppose.

I have now shortly outlined the sort of amendments upon which compromise may be possible, though I admit the task of negotiation will be extremely difficult at every point. Anything beyond that which I have discussed—as, for example, any attempt to extend the 'facilities' plan to the Council schools, anything in the nature of a test for teachers, or any attempt to make denominational religious teaching a part of the public provision of elementary education—will mean a deadlock at once. Therefore let both Lords and denominationalists go warily. Let them agree with their adversary quickly whilst he is in the way with them, lest a worse thing fall upon them. I put this in no minatory spirit; but I put it all the same. If they will only face facts frankly, they will see that the Bill gives them, under its scheme of facilities, quite as much definite dogmatic religious teaching as they get to-day, and in the vast majority of the Church of England schools a good deal more. Besides this, it takes the whole upkeep of the school premises, wherever a transfer is effected, entirely out of their hands; and remember these selfsame premises will still be available for all sorts of parochial purposes, for the wear and tear engendered by which the public will pay. Finally, wherever 'ordinary facilities' are applied for, the Bill adds a rental from the public purse for the use of the buildings. What better than this, let me ask any business-like denominationalist, does he expect to get?

T. J. MACNAMARA.

POSTSCRIPT : *August 16th.*—Since writing the foregoing the situation has been sensibly complicated by the decision of the Court of Appeal in the matter of the refusal of the West Yorks Education Authority to pay any salary for the time devoted by any teacher in a non-

provided school to the giving of denominational religious teaching. It has been the policy of that authority to deduct from the payments due to non-provided school teachers a moiety in respect of the time given to denominational teaching. Their policy was upheld in a County Court action; was thereafter declared to be *ultra vires* by the Court of King's Bench; and has now been declared to be legal by the Master of the Rolls and Lord Justice Farwell—Lord Justice Moulton dissenting—sitting as a Court of Appeal. The last decision, if it stands, cannot but have a most far-reaching effect not only upon the education controversy but also upon the political situation which will arise in the autumn. The decision intimates to Local Education Authorities all over the country that no obligation rests upon them to pay for denominational religious teaching. And no doubt, unless the matter is the subject of further revision, numbers of Local Authorities, especially in Wales, will follow the lead of the West Yorks Authority. This will be most embarrassing to denominationalists and very unfair to non-provided school teachers, who will either have to continue to give denominational teaching as a labour of love or rely for requitement on the fluctuating hand of voluntary contributions.

Of course all this makes confusion worse confounded, and it is more than ever the duty of the Government to go ahead with its determination to straighten out this woeful education tangle. All talk of the desirableness of withdrawing the Government Bill in view of the Court of Appeal decision is sheer nonsense. The decision accentuates the need for the Bill. At the same time there is no doubt the position of the Government is most substantially strengthened by the decision. If it cared to take a purely partisan view of the situation it could, if it wished, say to the denominationalists, 'Very well; you don't like our Bill; you need not have it. The Act of 1902, as interpreted by the Court of Appeal decision, leaves you to a large extent with our Bill *minus the million of money we have put into Clause XIII. to cover the cases of transfer; which million you would find very useful indeed in paying for the giving of that denominational teaching which the public funds no longer cover.*' Of course the Government would have to admit that there would still remain the questions of the management of non-provided schools and of immunity for teachers from tests for it to deal with. But these could be easily accomplished in a short two-clause Bill next session.

My view therefore is that when the Lords and the Clergy come to look carefully into the Court of Appeal decision—and I gravely doubt whether denominationalists will improve their position by carrying the matter to the still higher Court—they will come to the final consideration of the Government Bill in a much more consenting frame of mind than would have been the case if this momentous decision had never been given. If so, we may yet have a happy issue out of our difficulties.

T. J. M.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION

1

THE adjournment of Parliament for the autumn holidays affords breathing-time to note the position and prospects of the country and its institutions under Radical auspices.

The passage of the Education Bill through the House of Commons almost simultaneously with the presentation of the Report of the Royal Commission on Church Discipline marks a crisis of tremendous moment to the Church of England. I am not going to discuss the degree in which, were it to become law in the form in which it awaits the Committee stage in the House of Lords, it would impair the influence and confiscate the property of that Church, not having applied that diligence of study to this complex measure and to the debates thereon which would be necessary to qualify one to pronounce an opinion about its effect in these respects. It would be premature, also, to estimate the bearing upon Church interests of the recent decision of the Court of Appeal upon the suit of the West Riding County Council, as it seems likely that the case will be carried to the House of Lords. But it is open to anybody to collate the opinions of leading Churchmen upon the Bill as it stands, and to note the unanimity of protest from those representing every shade of ecclesiastical practice against the alienation of the funds invested by the Church on the faith of Acts of Parliament.

I have here [said the Archbishop of Canterbury in the debate on the 1st of August] the figures for three dioceses taken absolutely at random, and I find that, since 'the appointed day' under the Act of 1902, the diocese of Canterbury has spent 50,000*l.*, Oxford 57,000*l.*, and Winchester 105,000*l.* in the building of new schools. It surely is almost impossible to say that these schools can be taken over and entirely transformed in their character without an absolute violation of the whole traditions of English public security and of English public honour. . . . There will be something more than mere transformation—an absolute end of any true preservation of the principles for which this money was given and this effort made.

On the following day the Duke of Devonshire, surely the very type of an English lay Churchman, spoke with equal earnestness :

The managers [of transferred schools] will be appointed in future by the local authority, and the teachers will be appointed by the same body. The effect of that is that every security that has been provided by the deeds of Church schools for having Church teaching for Church people in Church schools will be absolutely swept away.

We all know [said the Bishop of Southwark] that it is not one party in the Church of England which is making resistance, but that it proceeds from all those who feel anxiety that, if we are to keep religion, the religion shall be real.

Unless the Bill is drastically altered [said Lord Halifax], neither the members of the Church of England nor the members of the Roman Catholic communion are going to submit to it. . . . The provisions of this Bill ignore the sacred rights of Christian children and Christian parents, outrage the rights of conscience and flatly contradict those principles of justice to which appeal is so constantly made in words.

Even the Bishop of Hereford, the solitary supporter of the Bill among his clerical colleagues in the Lords, advocates amendments which, if carried, would alter the measure in such important respects that it would hardly be recognised as that which the Government have spent months in driving through the House of Commons. Dr. Percival would have 'Biblical instruction according to the fundamental principles of the Christian faith' given day by day within the regular school hours in all public elementary schools; and he would sweep away the arbitrary limit of 5,000 population which the Bill fixes as determining the kind of religious teaching to be given in particular areas.

Quid plura? Quotations such as these from the speeches of clergy representing every variety of ecclesiastical opinion, and from laymen differing as widely as even the latitude of the Church of England permits, might be multiplied indefinitely. Nobody who has given any attention to the matter will be inclined to dispute the Bishop of London's assertion that 'the Church of England is so united in its opposition to the Bill as it has seldom been united before.'

This exemplary harmony would be most reassuring to those who desire earnestly to maintain the influence and protect the just rights of the Church, were there not signs, unhappily, that the harmony is only *ad hoc*, and that, were the external danger averted, an internal and more deadly one will have to be faced. The August number of this Review bears witness to the dissatisfaction with which extreme Evangelicals and extreme Ritualists have received the Report of the Royal Commission. That Report probably embodies the average opinion of the English laity. Anything less than the restrictions which it recommends to be imposed upon the licence exercised by Ritualist clergymen would have caused many men to alter their views as to the expediency of maintaining any longer the Established Church; anything more would have pointed in the direction of what is of all proceedings the most abhorrent to peaceable citizens—the prosecution and punishment of men for their religious beliefs.

Of the four writers who have dealt with the Report in the pages

of this Review, none is satisfied. The fifth and principal recommendation of the Commissioners is that when questions touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England arise in an appeal before the Final Court involving charges of heresy or breach of ritual, such questions shall be referred for decision to an assembly of the archbishops and bishops of both provinces. This recommendation, regarded by Sir George Arthur, whose sympathies are strongly with the ultra-Ritualists, as 'by far the most valuable part of the Report,' is vehemently denounced by Lady Wimborne, who protests that 'ecclesiastical rule has ever been and always will be foreign to our national character. We cannot be coerced by a handful of ecclesiastics, representing but an insignificant minority of the nation.' Canon Henson is even more emphatic, and brushes the whole Report aside because 'its recommendations surrender the principle at stake and ask the English people to purchase a doubtful relief from sporadic absurdities by giving national sanction to the Tractarian aspiration for ecclesiastical autonomy.' 'Sporadic,' be it said with all respect, seems a mild term to apply to practices which, as Canon Henson himself observes, have altered the aspect of public worship in more than 1,500 churches and have resulted in the presentation of a memorial to the Commissioners, signed by 2,519 clergymen, declaring it to be their duty to observe the Ornaments Rubric, 'especially with regard to the use of vestments.' No good will come out of an attempt to minimise the dilemma. The amount and energy of the disruptive agencies must be realised before considering any measures to mitigate the mischief.

The last of the quartette of writers, Mr Herbert Paul, declares his conviction that it would be hopeless to ask the House of Commons to sanction 'the reference of any charges brought before an ecclesiastical court to an assembly of bishops, perhaps the least judicial among all the orders of men.' Generalisations of this kind are always to be received with caution, but this one touches the kernel of the whole matter. What hope is there for a Church constituted under bishops if the Evangelical laity, on the one hand, deride their authority in matters spiritual as vested in 'the least judicial among the orders of men,' and the Ritualist clergy, on the other hand, deliberately defy the monitions of their bishops and, to quote the words of the Report, persist 'in practices significant of teaching repudiated by the Church of England'? Such a condition of things is sheer anarchy, and anarchy, if it cannot be reduced to order, must end in dissolution. The Roman Catholic will perceive in this anarchy the natural outcome of the right of private judgment. He can point to the four papers in this Review and show that the Protestant mind has become so disordered by the exercise of that right that it cannot be brought to recognise authority anywhere, except in the law courts supported by the police. He may claim as evidence the fact that, of the four

writers, only one, Lady Wimborne, recognises the fitness of the Commissioners for the work committed to them, but, as has been shown, has the strongest objection to their unanimous recommendation of a spiritual Court of Appeal, which she regards as 'meeting a prolonged and sustained course of law-breaking by revising the law to suit the law-breakers.' Of the other three writers, Canon Henson censures the 'irrelevant discussions' and 'gratuitous loquacity' of the Commissioners; Sir George Arthur reflects upon them as 'having come into being under what may be termed shady circumstances,' and Mr. Paul complains that they were 'not so impartially selected as they might have been,' and comments on 'the undue preponderance of High Churchmen.'

If, then, it has indeed come to this pass that Protestant Christians are incapable of recognising authority and submitting to control, the maintenance of a Church by the State has become a mockery. Speaking as the man in the street, I express my disbelief that matters have gone so far, though for the last fifty years they have been tending that way. For three hundred years the bishops ruled the Church of England, and their authority was never set at naught by their clergy or by those who remained members of that Church. Even now, the great mass of moderate opinion in the Church of England loyally supports the bishops in the exercise of their authority, desires to see them enforce it, and recognises them as the only court qualified by training, study, and position to pronounce impartial and discerning judgment upon 'any question touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England, which question is not . . . governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament.'

But that mass of moderate opinion will assuredly be alienated from the Church if it is found that what should be the guiding and controlling authority is incapable of steering a true course. By this term 'a true course' are implied no doctrines or system of theology beyond those professed by the Protestant Church of England when she went out from the Church of Rome. In doing so she rejected certain doctrines, practices, and symbolical observances which were and are taught and performed in the Church of Rome. About the precise doctrines rejected there exists no doubt; about the practices and observances there appears to be less exact means of information. It is in these that the ordinary Churchman looks for guidance to the bishops. If they pronounce it to be edifying and lawful for a Protestant clergyman to officiate one day in a green stole, another day in a purple, and a third day in a red one, and that it is expedient to revive these and other ceremonial garbs after three hundred years of tacit desuetude, the reasonable man will be satisfied; it is sanctioned by authority. But when these and similar novelties are displayed in open disregard of the episcopal monition, by clergy who refuse to call themselves, and object to being called, Protestant, it

is time to ask—Does the clergy exist for the Church, or the Church for the clergy?

It is improbable that the present Parliament will come to an end without having to discuss a measure or motion for disestablishing the Church of England, which will unite the clergy of all its subdivisions in harmony as exemplary as they have exhibited in opposition to the Education Bill. But the clergy are not the Church, and the issue of any attack upon the Church depends upon the unwavering support of lay Churchmen. Much has been done to cause them to waver; something must be done to restore their whole-hearted allegiance. It rests with the extreme parties within the Church to do this. Is each of them willing to yield something out of consideration for the other, and sacrifice, not principles, but prepossession in the interest of the whole?

Evangelicals interpret as signs of corruption the desire and inclination of many of their fellow-Churchmen, clergy and laity, for fuller and more elaborate forms in public worship than are edifying to themselves. Can they not bring themselves to recognise in this a phenomenon of growth and adaptation to the wants of a living organisation. The liturgy and rubrics, while prescribing certain things which shall or shall not be done, lay down no rule about others, thereby appearing to contain provision for a reasonable degree of modification in practice. It is asking too much that the difference between the intellectual atmospheres of the sixteenth and twentieth centuries should find no reflection in the spiritual atmosphere. Nay, do not the Evangelicals themselves manifest response to the change which has come over the spirit of Christianity by demanding the disuse of the creed erroneously attributed to St. Athanasius?

On the other hand, it is no extravagant demand upon the forbearance of the ultra-Ritualist clergy that, so long as they derive emolument from their position within the Church, they should desist from those practices which have been pronounced contrary to the law and practice of the Church, and which are offensive and disquieting to the great majority of Protestant Christians.

What prospect is there of attaining this measure of mutual concession? Not much, it must be sorrowfully admitted, judging from the four articles in the August number of this Review. Here are the two voices:

(1) We may take it [says Lady Wimborne] as an accepted fact that no revision of the rubrics which would satisfy even the less advanced members of the Ritualist party would ever be assented to by the more Protestant section of the Church.

(2) A solid phalanx of the Catholic school [writes Sir George Arthur], to which is joined a very large number of men of so-called moderate views, backed by a goodly company of Evangelicals, is finally determined to stand no tampering with the Prayer-book, and especially with the *Quicunque vult*.

If these are indeed the last words—if both sides continue to

vociferate 'No surrender!' then must the Church of England enter upon the coming struggle deprived of the support of that staunch, if mostly inarticulate, body of its members and friends which has never failed it hitherto. They have stood by the Church in resisting the Education Bill because they were determined that religion, and not a mere nebulous code of ethics, should be an integral part of national education. But they will not stand by a Church which has confessed its impotency to control the vagaries of its priesthood and appears half-ashamed of the masculine Protestantism which it is its mission to maintain. The clergy, as aforesaid, are not the Church, but the destiny of the Church of England is entrusted to their keeping. That destiny is secure only so long as the clergy retain the confidence of the laity—a confidence which has been grievously shaken by overt dissension upon graver matters than copes and chasubles, incense and lights. Nevertheless, it is in these comparative trivialities, for which the average lay mind can find little patience, that the clergy can most effectively manifest a sense of discipline and reassure their perplexed flocks. In doing so, they will make no surrender of liberty, for the Church of England has always allowed ample latitude for High and Low within her borders; but they must not construe liberty into licence.

Speaking as a layman who would fain remain loyal to the Church as I believed it to be when I was confirmed, I am forced to admit that no more staggering blow to loyalty has been dealt than was conveyed by Lord Hugh Cecil's two letters to the *Times* on the 14th and 18th of August. The sentiments of an individual layman might not be held to compromise the cause of the Church of England; but Lord Hugh is no ordinary layman. He was the recognised and able champion of the High Church party in the last Parliament, and spoke with acknowledged authority in all matters affecting their interests.* It is a grievous disappointment to those who have watched his rise with admiration, and looked forward to his future position with bright hopes, to recognise in his advocacy of passive resistance to legal obligations the moral obliquity which the enemies of sacerdotalism allege is the natural effect of that influence. He perceives, as we all do, that Nonconformists have scored a success by passive resistance. 'The only resource,' says he, 'is to imitate their methods. So shall we be again on equal terms.' These are the ethics of Donnybrook Fair; but worse was to follow. When Sir West Ridgeway asked pithily the question which must have occurred to most readers of Lord Hugh Cecil's first letter—namely, what moral difference could be shown between passive resistance and the plan of campaign, his lordship stooped to a sorry casuistry to justify his advice.

The refusal to pay taxes and the refusal to pay debts are not the same; one is an offence against the State, the other against an individual; one is rebellious, the other is dishonest. . . . The breach of law is of the slightest; the full pay-

ment required by law on account of education would still be made, but by a different channel from that legally proscribed.

That is, by distraint; which is precisely the channel through which a defaulting debtor would be compelled to pay. If this kind of reasoning were to be interpreted as the fruit of denominational religious instruction, many people might consider that such instruction were better discontinued. By these letters Lord Hugh Cecil has done much to forfeit the confidence which his courage and ability had secured. That is mainly his own affair: what is of deeper concern is the injury he has inflicted upon the cause of the Church by this crude revelation of the tactics of one of the parties therein. Of this we may rest assured—that a considerable number of those who warmly support the Church of England do so not because of any niceties of doctrine or ritual, but because of her hitherto inflexible attitude as a bulwark of law and order. If that attitude were to be altered—if the Church, or any considerable party therein, were to refuse to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's—the result might be swift and irrevocable.

Action upon the Report of the Commissioners can scarcely be long postponed. However unwilling the Government may feel to enter upon the difficult question, it will be forced upon them by their own supporters, and the disestablishment party will seize the opportunity for a flank attack. If the Church is able to bring into the field all the forces which have hitherto borne arms under her colours, the result need not be feared; but unless it can be shown that internal anarchy is to be firmly repressed, many of us must stand aloof and witness with profound sorrow the destruction of a venerable national institution, ennobled by priceless services to humanity and endeared by countless associations.

Turning from ecclesiastical to secular affairs, there is one among the somewhat numerous precedents set by the present Parliamentary majority, which must have caused some good Liberals to wince, as it has caused Unionists to blush, for the dignity of the Mother of Parliaments. Not content with impressing the electors of the United Kingdom with a dread of the consequences of a rational and moderate revision of our fiscal system, and with misrepresenting and exaggerating the proposals for broadening the basis of taxation put forward by Tariff Reformers, 274 members of the Imperial Parliament set their names to a solemn appeal, addressed to the electors of the Australian Commonwealth, beseeching them to turn a deaf ear to their own Prime Minister, Mr. Deakin, who has announced that preferential trading within the Empire will be the principal constructive part in the programme to be submitted to the constituencies at the forthcoming Commonwealth elections. Had this precious document issued from a Unionist source, one can imagine

the outcry that pious Radicals would have raised at such an unwarrantable attempt to sway the judgment of a free and independent electorate. It is to be hoped that its true genesis will be thoroughly explained to Australian electors, and that they will be made to understand that the overwhelming majority of those whose signatures the managers of the Cobden Club were successful in securing are members new to the House of Commons, and therefore unversed in Parliamentary etiquette. It seems hardly possible that many of the signatories can have made themselves acquainted with the document to which they have appended their names, else they must have paused before endorsing its abject prayer and most misleading statements.

The question gravely affects us in the old country, and we therefore earnestly ask you to consider its bearing upon our interests before you give your vote upon it. Our people have recently elected their representatives to the Imperial Parliament, and the question of preference which is now about to be submitted to you was by far the most important question submitted to them. Their judgment was against the proposal, and against it by a majority more decisive and overwhelming than has ever before been recorded in our history as a people.

Agreed that a preferential readjustment of import duties was the most important question submitted at the General Election, it is only people at the Antipodes who could be brought to believe that the Yellow Labour and Education bogeys had not at least as much to do with the result as the big and little loaf.

The naïveté of the appeal would be comic if it were not so humiliating. Australian electors are adjured to abstain from supporting a policy which their ablest statesmen believe to be essential to their material interests (a belief which it will probably be found that the great majority of colonists share), 'above all, for the sake of that goodwill between you and us,' which rests, it is explained, upon 'a free and unpurchased connection resting upon common blood, common traditions, and common aspirations.' The counterpart to the 'free and unpurchased connection'—namely, a connection strengthened by common commercial interest—has been derided by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman as 'sordid bonds'; but whether is it more sordid, if that be the proper epithet to apply to patriotic anxiety for imperial welfare and unity, for the Colonists to advocate a policy which they believe would greatly stimulate their prosperity (and, as many people believe, would materially add to the security of our own), or for us to denounce it in advance lest our own well-filled pockets should suffer in an infinitesimal degree? The argument of the memorialists being that our 'goodwill' towards the Colonies will be 'jeopardised by action which, while favouring the Colonial producer, may cause a slight temporary rise in the price of certain commodities to the British consumer, how can they escape the conclusion that Colonial goodwill

must be strained by a refusal even to entertain the proposal? 'We maintain,' runs the memorial, 'that there is no offer within your power to make that would compensate us for a tax upon our food.' In other words, while we are not ashamed to ask you to retain the goodwill (of the Cobden Club) by abstaining from a fiscal policy which nobody doubts would be to the advantage of your people, we recoil in horror from the risk of having to make the slightest sacrifice in order to retain *your* goodwill.

That this risk is involved in the adoption of preferential trade within the Empire is assumed for the purposes of the Cobden Club, and grotesquely exaggerated by those whose political future depends on the permanence of its influence. 'It would make the food of our people both scarcer and dearer.' As for scarcity, what in Heaven's name has been our purpose in overrunning the most fertile regions of the earth but to provide sustenance for our people? The potential output of wheat within British territory is well-nigh incalculable. Canada alone is capable of supplying all the bread-stuffs that can be consumed in the United Kingdom. It is true that if her farmers had a monopoly of our corn imports they might control the price to our inconvenience; but there would be plenty of intra-imperial competition—Australasian, Indian, and South African. Then as to dearness—'Think of it,' whine the memorialists, 'and you will see that there is no tax that can be devised or imposed that presses so constantly and so grievously upon the people of a country as a tax upon their food.' Here they are presuming upon the ignorance of Australian electors as to the effect of the shilling duty upon corn whereby Lord St. Aldwyn, when Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1902, added a cool two millions and a half to the credit side. So little was 'the life of the workman in this country daily embittered by a sense of the wrong done to him' by this tax upon food—so far were our people from being conscious of the grievous and constant pressure, that no householder could detect the smallest increase in the price of living; nay, the price of the quartern loaf actually fell in some towns

IMPORTS OF BREADSTUFFS INTO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

	Quantities (Thousands of Cwt.)			Values (Thousands of £)		
	1901	1902	1903	1901	1902	1903
Wheat	69,709	81,002	88,131	23,081	27,080	29,940
Wheatmeal and Flour	22,576	19,386	20,601	10,342	8,926	9,724
Barley	24,873	25,201	26,556	6,163	7,132	7,222
Oats	22,471	15,857	16,284	6,346	5,041	4,261
Rye	1,266	1,118	1,151	341	312	303
Maize, Maize- meal, &c.	53,011	44,736	50,689	12,844	11,796	12,643
Other Sorts	13,908	16,648	15,213	6,086	6,185	6,414
Totals	204,814	203,978	218,655	65,208	66,772	70,510

during the incidence of that tax. Nor was the bulk of our corn imports stinted by the tax, although it fell upon all corn, foreign and colonial alike. From the table, given on p. 493 it may be seen that the imports of wheat and barley continued to increase during the time of its incidence, while the imports of oats, which cannot be reckoned as contributing, except infinitesimally, to our food supply, showed a remarkable falling-off.

Taking wheat and flour together, and converting the flour into its equivalent of grain, the imports of wheat would be represented by the figures 101, 108, and 115 million cwts. respectively for the three years. Thus the quantity of wheat imported rose by equal increments between 1901 and 1902 and between 1902 and 1903.

Wheat prices for the same years, taken from official sources, show some remarkable results :

	1901	1902	1903
WHEAT. Price per quarter ; average farm value in U.S.A. (official)	20 9½	21 0	23 2
Average export price (Cal. Year)	24 4	25 11	25 10½
Import price U.K.	28 4	28 8	29 1
U.K. <i>Gazette</i> Price of home-grown wheat	26 9	28 1	26 9
Freights :			
Lake and canal (per qr.)	1 8½	1 9	1 10
New York to Liverpool (per qr.)	0 10	0 11½	0 11½

It is to be noted that, while the export price of wheat from the United States in 1902 showed an increase of 1s. 7d. over that of 1901, the average import price into the United Kingdom from *all* sources rose only 4d., although the price of home-grown wheat rose by 1s. 4d., probably owing to the fine quality of the harvest of 1902. It does not appear that any part of the increase in the export price was due to the slight rise in freights ; because, taking the lowest inland rate quoted for the United States, the average rate per quarter of wheat rose by a halfpenny only in 1902 as compared with 1901, the Atlantic rate rising by three-halfpence in the same time, a total rise in freight of twopence per quarter. The fact that the import price to the United Kingdom followed so closely the farm value of wheat in the United States during these years, *notwithstanding that the import price contained the shilling duty*, is conclusive proof that neither the tax nor any fraction of it was paid by the consumer on this side of the water.

In their eagerness to check the desire of the Colonial electorate for preferential trade, the draftsmen of this memorial have not scrupled to employ most misleading language. After complaining about the scarcity and dearness of food which they declare would be the result of such a policy, they hasten to add :

It will not have this effect upon your food. You produce from your own soil a larger supply than you consume, and you export from your abundance.

We, on the other hand, have to import the larger part of all that we consume, and we were asked to submit to a tax upon *this* in order that you might have a preference on so much of it as you send to us.

We have never been asked to submit to a tax upon *this*—that is, upon ‘the larger part of all that we consume’—but only upon that part which may be grown outside the limits of the Empire, of which part we should be made perfectly independent by the development of Indian and Colonial corn lands.

All this outcry is caused by Mr. Chamberlain’s proposal to put a 2s. duty upon foreign, as distinguished from Indian and Colonial, corn—double the amount which, in 1902–3, was found to be imperceptible by the British consumer. That is the utmost demand ever formulated even by the Tariff Reform League. It is scarcely conceivable that the effect upon home prices would be appreciable, even during the first few years while Colonial wheat-growers were responding to what would be a valuable stimulus to their industry.

While the Cobden Club and their 274 ingenuous cat’s-paws declare that by a preferential tax of 2s. upon foreign corn ‘the life of the workman in this country would be daily embittered by the wrong done to him,’ they add that ‘you (Australian electors) happily do not know this from experience.’ If not, why not? seeing that the democratic Governments of Australia maintain an import duty of between 7s. and 8s. upon *all* imported corn—a food tax four times greater than it has been proposed to put upon *part* of our imported corn. Oh, but, the memorialists argue, the Australians ‘export from their abundance’; they grow more than they can eat; the import duty has no effect upon the price of their food. Is not the fallacy here glaring? If the import duty results practically in the total exclusion of all competitive external supplies (and it is not pretended that it is imposed for any other purpose), the tendency must be to stiffen corn prices in Australian markets.

After all, however groundless one may consider the apprehensions expressed by the memorialists, there would be no reason to doubt their sincerity, were they not supported by statements flagrantly and recklessly inconsistent with facts. It is easy to acquit the majority, at least, of those who were persuaded to sign the memorial of intentional *suggestio falsi*; but how can the committee of the Cobden Club, which drafted it, be absolved of insincerity in having induced members of Parliament to sign a declaration that the movement for preferential trade had its origin in the bosom of a political party in the United Kingdom? ‘We know,’ these 274 dupes are made to protest, ‘that the proposal did not come from you, but from certain politicians among ourselves.’ Now, seeing that the Cobden Club exists for the sole purpose of maintaining and disseminating the ultramontane doctrines of Free Trade, its committee must necessarily be thoroughly informed of all the phases in the fiscal

controversy. How is one to avoid the conviction that this statement was uttered with the deliberate intention of rousing the suspicion of Australian electors towards the movement by representing it as set on foot to serve a party purpose in the Mother Country? Nothing could be further from the truth. The desire for Imperial preferential trade was in active existence in Australia very many years before it received official recognition in this country. It was a spontaneous growth springing out of the natural instincts of British communities beyond the seas, a growth whereof Mr. Chamberlain was the first statesman in the Mother Country to perceive the vigour and potentiality. He has repeatedly explained that he only realised the extent and reasonableness of Colonial desire for closer commercial union with the United Kingdom after he had received the seals of the Colonial Office in 1895, a desire which a long series of his predecessors had practically pooh-poohed or ignored; and it was this that weaned him from the rigid Cobdenite doctrines in which he had been trained.

It would be easy to prove the earnestness with which Colonial statesmen have been pressing this matter long before Mr. Chamberlain took it up, by quoting from their speeches at the conference of Colonial Premiers held in London in 1897; but quotations are open to suspicion of being divorced from the context to serve special purposes. I prefer to quote from the exceedingly condensed report of the conference given in the *Annual Register*, an admittedly impartial authority:

The Premiers then expressed severally their views upon the points raised. In reference to the question of closer political union, they felt that the time was not ripe for change, and Mr. Reid (N. S. Wales), Sir George Turner (Victoria), and Mr. Kingston (Queensland) particularly were said to have urged the fear that, if it were attempted to draw the Colonies into a political partnership at this stage, the effect might be disastrous to Imperial unity. . . . The debate on the question of closer trade relations resolved itself into the consideration of the position of Canada in respect to her preferential tariff, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, supported by every other Premier, strongly urged Mr. Chamberlain to denounce the treaties with Belgium and Germany, which were said to stand in the way of preference being given by Canada to Great Britain.

(The italics are mine.) Six years elapsed after this conference before Mr. Chamberlain imparted a new and vivid interest to Imperial politics by his speech at Birmingham in May 1903, summoning his countrymen to awake to the reality and responsibility of Empire; yet these 274 members of Parliament have been hoodwinked by the Cobden Club into affirming that the proposal for preferential trade did not come from the Colonies, 'but from certain politicians among ourselves'!

The fact is, as experience has amply shown, that the statements of out-and-out Free Traders need to be accepted with great caution. It is surprising how impatient they sometimes show themselves of the humdrum limitations of fact, when fact happens to be so stubborn

as not to suit their purpose. There was an instance of this in the speech made at Manchester on the 23rd of June by Mr. Lloyd-George. In company with Mr. Burns and Mr. Winston Churchill he travelled down to take part in a Liberal demonstration to celebrate the overthrow of Unionism in that city. Mr. Lloyd-George, in loyal and laudable eagerness to explain to his audience the material benefits already derived from the accession of his party to power, dealt with the commercial aspect of the case, and his sanguine survey doubtless was accepted all the more confidently as coming from the President of the Board of Trade. But he committed himself to a statement which must have sounded strangely to such of his hearers as are in the habit of studying the stock and share lists. After dwelling upon the blessings already derived from the overthrow of the Unionist Government, and claiming increase in the volume of trade and growth of exports as the fruits of Radical statesmanship, he went on to say that 'Consols, which indicate the state of credit of the country, were rising, so that the country seemed to be fairly satisfied and increasing in prosperity.' Now, it so happened that, on the very day when Mr. Lloyd-George was thus holding forth, Consols touched the lowest point they had reached during the present year; and therefore, according to the speaker's own showing, the credit of the country, so far from having been raised by the advent to power of a Liberal Ministry, has been seriously impaired. Nor has Mr. Lloyd-George's speech helped to restore confidence, for it was followed by still further depression in the premier public security and in the other gilt-edged stocks which usually move in sympathy with it. Here are the quotations of a few of them on the Monday following the Saturday on which Mr. Lloyd-George spoke, compared with the highest quotations of the same stocks during 1905:

Name of Stock	25th June, 1906	High in 1905	• Fall
Consols	87 $\frac{1}{8}$	92	4 $\frac{5}{8}$
Irish Land	88 $\frac{1}{4}$	95 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 $\frac{3}{4}$
Bank of England Stock	284	308	24
County Council 3 per Cent.	89 $\frac{3}{4}$	97 $\frac{1}{4}$	8
India 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent.	102 $\frac{1}{2}$	109	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
India 3 per Cent.	93 $\frac{1}{8}$	100	6 $\frac{7}{8}$
Cape Colony 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent.	102	105	3
Great Eastern Railway Ordinary	82	93 $\frac{3}{4}$	11 $\frac{1}{4}$
Great Western Ordinary	131 $\frac{1}{2}$	146	14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Brighton Deferred	117	131 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Midland Deferred	68 $\frac{1}{4}$	75	6 $\frac{3}{4}$
London and North-Western Ordinary	157 $\frac{1}{4}$	162	4 $\frac{1}{4}$
Great Western 4 per Cent. Debentures	125	131	6
London and North-Western 4 per Cent. Debentures	119	126	7
London and South-Western 4 per Cent. Debentures	118	125	7
London and North-Western 3 per Cent. Debentures	95	101	6

A month later Consols had undergone a further fall, being quoted on the 20th of July at 86½. By that time Mr. Lloyd-George had chosen another theme for an optimist speech. Addressing the students on board the mercantile marine training-ship *Worcester*, he told them that 'the mercantile marine of this country was the most remarkable the world had ever seen, and there was no symptom that the shipping of this country was a decaying industry. Indeed, there never was a time in the history of the country, when it was more thriving and showed greater signs of prosperity in the future.' The President of the Board of Trade may be supposed to speak with authority upon this subject; it is not a little remarkable, therefore, that an article in the *Economist*, entitled "The Depression in Shipping," should have appeared almost simultaneously with his speech. The writer of this article points out that the present activity in shipbuilding is only adding to the existing enormous over-supply of merchant tonnage, and that steamers are being brought home in ballast in order to carry outward freights at unremunerative rates, and that the competition between liners and tramps has been carried to a ruinous pitch.

The only hope [says he] is in the cessation of orders for new ships. . . . As a matter of fact this remedy has already begun, for the new contracts for cargo vessels which shipbuilders are now receiving have become few and far between. It is a remedial course which by and-by will be severely felt in the shipbuilding trades, but these industries have had their term of prosperity in preparing for shipping the term of suffering in which it is once more plunged. It will emerge, of course, as it has emerged before, full of vigour and enterprise, but there is no use blinking the fact that the British shipowner is once more in the midst of evil days.

When a Cabinet Minister indulges in views as to the present so irreconcilable with known facts, it inspires some misgiving in respect to the forecast of our foreign relations by which his colleagues explain that they have been guided in cutting down the Army and Navy. It may be hoped that their forecast is sounder than that of Mr. Pitt in 1792, when he put into the Speech from the Throne the paragraph which runs :

The friendly assurances received from Foreign Powers induce me to think that some immediate reduction might safely be made in our naval and military establishments.

Made it was accordingly; but Mr. Pitt's forecast had not taken Napoleon into account.

HERBERT MAXWELL.

* * In the outline of reform of the House of Lords which was submitted in the July number of this Review, considerations of space caused me to refrain from entering upon details in the method by which such reform should be effected. It has been pointed out by numerous correspondents and others that the scheme is scarcely

intelligible without some indication as to the method by which, at the beginning of each new Parliament, the Peers should elect a limited number of their own House to form the Upper Legislative Chamber. I desire to say that I consider the principle of proportionate representation, or some other check upon over-representation, as essential to any such reform. It is clear that, in a constituency with such a preponderance of Conservatives as the House of Lords, simple *scrutin-de-liste* would result in the minority being wholly unrepresented, as it is among the Scottish and Irish representative Peers at the present day. The difficulty of applying proportionate representation to a body like the House of Lords may be insuperable. It might be avoided by enacting that two-thirds or one-half only of the Upper House should be elected by the Peers themselves, leaving the other half or third to be appointed by the Sovereign on the advice of the Prime Minister of the day. These appointed Lords either might be taken from the existing body of Peers, or some of them might be Commoners whose services in the Upper Chamber it might be desired to secure by conferring life-peerages upon them.

H. E. M

THE POLITICAL SITUATION

II

THE decision of the Court of Appeal in the case of the West Riding came with a shock of surprise to the numerous persons who are always ready to foretell everything, except what can be foretold. No one can have been in the least astonished by it who read the *obiter dicta* of the Master of the Rolls and Lord Justice Farwell during the argument, as reported in the *Times*. It has been pointed out, and it is of course true, that, as the Court of Appeal was divided, and the Divisional Court, also consisting of three judges, was unanimous, though one doubted, the opinion of two judges has prevailed against the opinion of four. But in law, if anywhere, *sententiæ ponderandæ sunt, non numerandæ*. The Divisional Court was singularly, almost scandalously, weak. The Court of Appeal was unusually strong. Lord Justice Moulton's dissent from his colleagues would carry more weight if he had really differed with them on the simple construction of statutes. But he seems to have thought that he was entitled to use the knowledge he had acquired in the late House of Commons, and to interpret Acts of Parliament in accordance with the presumed intentions of those who framed them. Against this doctrine the majority of the Court protested, and it seems to be entirely at variance with a long chain of accepted judgments. Quite apart from the recognised rule that Acts must be construed in their plain grammatical meaning, unless such construction involves a manifest absurdity, any other principle is essentially fallacious. The Government may mean one thing, and the Legislature may mean another. The minority may disagree with the majority upon interpretation as well as upon policy. If Mr. Balfour had avowed in 1902 that he proposed to alter the whole character of a public elementary school as defined by the original Education Act of 1870, it is at least possible that he might not have carried his point. Nor can anyone say except Mr. Balfour himself, or at least some member of his Cabinet, that he had any such intention. Lord Justice Farwell, than whom no abler judge sits upon the Bench, has laid down as sound law what the Liberal party in Opposition contended to be sound policy. If, said the Lord Justice,

Parliament exempts denominational teaching from the control of the local authority, it follows that local rates cannot be applied to such teaching, unless Parliament has said in so many words that they can. No such words are to be found in the Act of 1902, and therefore the County Council of the West Riding was justified in refusing to pay for religious instruction at sectarian schools. With this conclusion the Master of the Rolls, as eminent in common law as Lord Justice Farwell in equity, entirely concurred. •

This memorable judgment does not, it will be seen, fully legalise the conduct of the passive resisters. They refused to pay any rates for denominational schools at all. The Court of Appeal only says that rates were properly withheld from the specific purpose of sectarian teaching, and it is to that extent alone that the ratepayers have been overcharged. To that extent, I presume, they are entitled to a return of money paid under a mistake of law. The *Times* has argued that the judgment merely gives an option, and that county councils which choose to pay for sectarianism are free to do so. It does not require a very profound knowledge of law to show that this argument will not hold water. County councils owe their origin to the Local Government Act of 1888, and are the creatures of statute. Before the Act of 1902 they could not give a penny to elementary education at all. It is simply by virtue of that Act that they can do so now. The *ratio decidendi* in the West Riding case is not between option and compulsion, but between a power which must, if it existed, be exercised, and no power at all. The County Council of the West Riding was either bound to make these payments, or it was not entitled to make them. If after this judgment any other council votes money for religious instruction in schools where the Cowper-Temple clause does not prevail, the auditor will be bound to surcharge the councillors themselves. The judgment must, I suppose, be taken as final. The Attorney-General might in his discretion appeal to the House of Lords, who might, if they pleased, accelerate the hearing. But I cannot believe that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Cabinet would consent to such a waste of public funds when a comprehensive Bill, dealing with the whole subject, is actually before the Lords in their legislative character, and stands for Committee on the 24th of October, earlier than which no appeal could possibly be heard. The Bill expressly prohibits the application of rates or taxes to the general facilities for dogmatic teaching under Clause 3. The one part of the measure which could be affected by the judgment is Clause 4, providing for special facilities, or, in other words, for the continuance of denominational schools in populous places, at the wish of the parents in a majority of four to one ascertained by ballot. To make any financial change in the Bill now would be difficult, if not impossible. For the Lords to make it would be a breach of privilege, and the Commons can only deal with the amendments of the Lords. But

even the Catholic schools, which are the poorest, would not be much embarrassed by the obligation to pay for teaching their own faith; and, on the other hand, the dislike which many Nonconformists feel for the clause might be lessened by the change.

One result of the judgment is ludicrous enough. The West Riding of Yorkshire was frequently cited in the House of Commons as a rebellious, 'pig-headed' body which would not obey the law. It was answered at the time, with truth and point, that the Council was only anxious to raise the question, and to obtain an authoritative reply. The reply has now come, and is one more example of the French proverb that those laugh well who laugh last. Lord Hugh Cecil, however, is very serious. His sense of humour, usually active, is slumbering, and he gravely proposes that Churchmen should become passive resisters. By 'Churchmen' Lord Hugh means opponents of the Education Bill. His reasoning is severely simple, and his syllogism is perfect. Thus it runs: All Churchmen disapprove of the Education Bill. The Bishop of Carlisle approves of the Education Bill; therefore the Bishop of Carlisle is not a Churchman. If Lord Hugh's premisses were true, his conclusion would be true also. To make them true the major premiss must be: 'Some Churchmen disapprove of the Education Bill.' But that involves the fallacy of the undistributed middle, and the syllogism becomes nonsense. The fact that Lord Hugh Cecil can speak for about one Churchman in five hundred never for a moment deters him from pretending to speak for the whole Church. In the spirit of the true fanatic he regards mere facts as irrelevant absurdities, which cannot stand before the constant repetition of dogmatic denial. No one can argue better in a circle, or move round with more practical utility, unless it be a squirrel in a cage. The passive resistance of Nonconformists to payment of rates for unprovided schools was an emphatic protest against a new law. The passive resistance of Churchmen now would be a belated expression of an historic opinion that Parliament was wrong in 1870 to rate denominationalists for undenominational schools. I feel bound, however, to add that some of Lord Hugh's critics have gone far beyond him in wildness and weirdness of suggestion. The proposal that, because the late Government blundered over their Education Bill in 1902, the present Government should abandon the Education Bill of 1906 transcends in naked fatuity all my experience of the silly season in journalism, and that is saying a good deal.

Second to it, though a long way second, is the brilliant idea that the House of Lords, having read the Bill a second time without a division before amending it, should, after their amendments have been made, reject it on the third reading. A less insane course would be to postpone the stage of committee for three months, and thus destroy the Bill. But then the Bill must be followed by another, of which the only safe prediction to make is that Clause 1 would re-

appear, and that Clause 3 would not. The debate in the Lords on the second reading, however, does not portend any policy of despair. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a speech of statesmanlike moderation, acknowledged the case for the measure, and pointed out the changes, some of them reasonable enough, which should, he thought, be made in Committee. Like some of his less prudent brethren, the Archbishop made the most of Huddersfield, a terrible town, where in the Council schools no religious teaching is given, except that the Bible is read and hymns are sung. It appears from statistics supplied by Lord Stanley of Alderley that the crime of Huddersfield is committed chiefly by persons educated in the schools of the Church. But, whatever that fact may or may not prove, it was strange to hear the Primate of All England say that reading the Bible and singing hymns can have no effect upon children. I should be sorry to go bail for the hymns. There are hymns and hymns; some sublime, some stupid, some nauseous. But that children can hear the New Testament read day after day, and be none the better for it, is a paradox which the unepiscopal mind instinctively rejects. It is curious how little confidence the bishops seem to feel in the Bible. I remember a very great musician being thanked for the noble simplicity with which he played the works of the masters. Others, it was said, introduced flourishes of their own. 'Yes,' he observed with a smile, 'they do not trust Beethoven.' His Grace of Canterbury can apply the moral. From the episcopal benches came also the best speech against the Bill. The Bishop of Ripon and the Bishop of Hereford proved once more the staleness and futility of the falsehood that the Church of England as an institution opposes the measure. The Bishop of Southwark is the most intellectual and accomplished representative of a school which desires, if it has any definite aim, to facilitate reunion with Rome by depriving the Church of England of its essentially Protestant character. These ecclesiastics are not very likely to succeed in their object. But it is not at all improbable that they may disestablish the Church. Not much was heard in the Lords about teaching everybody's religion, as recommended by that strange pair the Bishop of Birmingham and Mr. Chamberlain. Of all solutions yet offered for the problem which the Government are now endeavouring to settle this is the most fantastic, the most un-English, and the most grotesque. No practical educationalist takes it seriously, and to insist upon it can only strengthen the hands of the Secularists, as Mr. Chamberlain probably perceives. But, as the Bishop of Birmingham persists in airing his fad through the columns of the *Times*, a word of warning may be a word in season. The first school in which the folly of belief in God was taught to the children of atheists, who are also, the Bishop must remember, ratepayers, at the public expense would be in imminent danger of material destruction at the hands of people who do not ordinarily commit, or even contemplate,

any lawless or violent act. This is a Christian country, and there are limits to what it will endure. But there are apparently no limits to the desperate expedients at which a fanatical dogmatist will clutch rather than be content that children shall be taught the religion of Christ. One would really think that this religion was as new to the Bishop of Birmingham as it was at the beginning of the session to Mr. Chamberlain. Yet, even if we claim for it no older or higher author than Mr. Cowper-Temple, it has been successfully taught in hundreds of elementary schools for five-and-thirty years. Few legislators know much about it, though, as the Bishop of Hereford reminded the Peers, it is not essentially different from what they received themselves. I have had the great advantage of hearing it expounded by my friend Mr. David Hodge, the master of the Council schools in Cheyne Row, and I am sure that it would satisfy any Protestant as pious, wholesome, rational, and sound. That Catholics and atheists would from different points of view repudiate it I willingly concede to the Bishop of Birmingham. All other classes of parents—Churchmen, Nonconformists, or Freethinkers—are perfectly content. But the most impressive words spoken in the House of Lords had nothing to do with the irreligious difficulty. They were the final sentences of the Duke of Devonshire's speech, and they referred to the position of the Lords themselves. He reminded them that a time which had not come yet would come soon, and that they would then have to deal with issues far more momentous than any question raised by the Bill. It is nonsense to suppose that these issues are affected in the remotest degree by the decision of the Court of Appeal.

While the House of Lords was reading the Education Bill a second time, the House of Commons was amending the Trade Disputes Bill in the way desired by the special representatives of labour. That the Government have suffered in credit by their treatment of this Bill is a proposition which cannot be disputed. The bulk of their supporters were pledged to the policy of replacing the law in the position which it occupied by general consent before the Taff Vale case was decided by the Lords of Appeal. That was the main object of Mr. Shackleton's Bill in the late Parliament, and for the principle of that Bill nine Liberal candidates in every ten had promised to vote. The Bill as originally introduced did not carry out that promise, and Ministers had therefore to make their measure in Committee what they should have made it before. As the Bill now stands, awaiting Report, it protects the funds of trades unions, or of masters' associations, from liability for the acts of agents in strikes or lock-outs. When we consider that, so far as trades unions are concerned, this was universally assumed to be the law for a generation, and that nobody proposed to alter it, fear of the consequences which may ensue from reverting to it does seem an idle panic. Even now the Labour members are not satisfied. They almost put the Govern-

ment in a minority by voting with Sir Charles Dilke that peaceful picketing, expressly declared by the Bill to be legal, should not be a nuisance, which is illegal. Only thirty Conservatives had come down to resist the perilous concession made by the Cabinet, and the Nestor of the party, Sir Francis Powell, supported the Attorney-General's new clause. Nevertheless, the Government were saved by Conservative votes from a defeat which would have seriously endangered the whole measure. There are wise heads among the Labour members, none wiser than Mr. Shackleton's. It is well worth their while to consider what they gain, and what they lose, by flouting the most democratic Cabinet that ever held office in England. For the loss of a Radical seat at Cockermouth the Independent Labour party are alone responsible. Their candidate is an accomplished wrecker, and this is not the first time that he has given a seat to a Conservative. But the fact can seldom be proved with such scientific certainty as when a majority seven months old is split in two, and a minority, thus become a majority, remains intact. The Cockermouth election is perhaps the strongest practical proof ever obtained of the need for a second ballot, at which Captain Guest, and not Sir John Randles, would have been returned. The cheap and speedy method proposed in Mr. John Robertson's Bill, which provides that a second, or preferential, vote for one of the first two candidates should be taken from the third if no candidate obtains a majority of the total poll, is the best form of meeting the difficulty which has yet been devised. The only seat yet lost to the Government would not have been lost in either France or Germany.

The general aspect of foreign affairs is more favourable than it has been at any time since the assemblage of the Conference at Algeciras. Although the gossip founded on the King's meeting with the German Emperor is rubbish, his Majesty has achieved honourable fame as a peacemaker, and his interviews with the heads of other nations, crowned or otherwise, have always assisted the diplomacy of his Ministers. Whatever else the General Election may or may not have been, it was a great vote of personal confidence in Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and never did Sir Henry make a wiser choice than when he entrusted the Foreign Office to Sir Edward Grey. It is, however, the Colonial Department which has lately been most conspicuous in the public eye, and belief in Lord Elgin increases with his success in solving difficult problems. Few politicians anticipated, whatever their own opinions might be, that a new Constitution could be made for the Transvaal which would come so near to pleasing all parties concerned. Mr. Churchill's masterly exposition in the House of Commons had a decisive effect upon public opinion here. In South Africa Sir West Ridgeway's Committee, which partisans in this country assailed as partisan, convinced all parties of its scrupulous fairness. The adoption of voters as the numerical

test, though it may be said to punish the Boers for having large families, was not in the circumstances unfair, and nobody on the spot objects to manhood suffrage for white men, or desires proportional representation. A Second Chamber, nominated at first by the Crown, is ample solace to the fears of capital. One seat more or less for Pretoria was at last the single point left in dispute, and it was decided against the Rand, which has the enormous power of wealth at its disposal. A constitution for the Orange River Colony is temporarily delayed, not in deference to Lord Milner's dark and sinister forebodings, but because there was not time to frame the two instruments together, and also because the Government wished to consult Sir Hamilton 'Goold-Adams, the Lieutenant-Governor, now on his way home. It is a good omen for the future peace and prosperity of the Transvaal that all attempts to set Dutch against British, or British against Dutch, have utterly failed. Mr. Gladstone used to say that when he was young there was a British party in every colony, but that in his old age he could happily see no trace of such a party anywhere. The deputation which Sir Percy Fitzpatrick brought to this country, and to the House of Commons, was quite unable to convince any impartial audience that it represented the British race. It represented the owners of the Rand, mostly foreigners, inheritors and expanders of Krugerism. Against the tyranny of monopolist capital British and Dutch outside Johannesburg, not unassisted by the few white workmen inside it, may be expected to combine. Already a breach has been made in the Chinese wall of yellow labour by the promise of an English Randlord, Mr. Robinson, to cancel his licences, and let Mr. Creswell work his mines with Kaffirs. Englishmen who venture to criticise the Rand, or to find fault with its policy, are always told by its agents in this country that they know nothing about the matter, and are contemptuously referred to the men on the spot. I have received a copy of a newspaper called *The Prince*, which is published on the spot, at Pretoria. *The Prince*, of whose conductors I know nothing, is written in an easy, familiar, forcible style, not unlike the style of *Truth*. Its politics appear to be Radical. But it is by no means favourable to the anti-Chinese party in the House of Commons, and it has a prejudice, which I cannot help thinking quite unfounded, against my friend Mr. Mackarness, who knows South Africa as well as any Englishman alive. This, however, is what *The Prince* said on the 21st of July about the plight of our newest constitutional Colony: 'The Chowlofs with their yellow labour policy have made the Transvaal what it is to-day—a country in which white labour is flouted and condemned, and in which everything is subordinated to the greed of gold of a grasping, soulless, conscienceless gang of cosmopolitan plutocrats.' And again, in the same number, we are told that 'although nominally governed by Great Britain, the Transvaal at the present time is governed by

capital, much of which has no claim to British interest or British origin. In this lies the secret of the injustice.' Now that the Transvaal is no longer to be governed by Great Britain, but by its own inhabitants, the working classes will assert their rights, and the first elections will be fought by capital against labour, rather than by British against Dutch. Krugerism is gone, and Milnerism is gone. The fight for complete liberty remains. Nothing is more creditable to Lord Selborne than his sympathetic treatment of the Boers, and his strictly impartial attitude towards all classes of his Majesty's subjects in South Africa. From the Government at home Lord Selborne has received loyal confidence and support. His political friends, who would have been better pleased if he had resigned when they did, have acted in a very different fashion. After hearing Mr Churchill explain the constitution, and Mr. Lyttelton compare it unfavourably with his own abortive scheme, the Tory Imperialists in the House of Commons voted in a body against the whole estimate for the Colonial Office, or, in other words, against the maintenance of the Colonial Empire as a going concern. If they wished to be known throughout the King's dominions as the anti-Colonial party they went the right way to work; otherwise their tactics can scarcely be called either judicious or patriotic. Happily they are no longer responsible for colonial affairs.

Their responsibility had not ceased when the scandals occurred on which the War Stores Commission reported last month. The Report is not cheerful reading. Mr. Arnold Forster may be pleased to find that even under Mr. Brodrick the War Office was in a state of chaotic futility. Liberals may reflect with some degree of complacency that it was their efforts in Opposition which led to this thorough and exhaustive inquiry. Mr. Douglas Richmond, who was Auditor-General at the time of the war, and his deputy, now his successor, Mr. Kempe, may congratulate themselves upon their vigour and acuteness in detecting the plunder of the public by contractors in South Africa. Sir William Butler, though the Report of his Committee was too eloquent and discursive for an official paper, has been proved to be right in his main points, that the dual system involved enormous waste, and that the Supply Department ought to have acted in unison with the Repatriation Board. The nation can only console itself with the knowledge that the melancholy truth is out at last. The cases of actual bribery disclosed by the Commissioners are few and unimportant. What must engender in the public mind a feeling almost akin to despair is the equal and utter incompetence of the Army Service Corps at Pretoria and of the War Office at home to protect the taxpayer from being used as a milch cow by any South African capitalist who saw in the cessation of hostilities an opportunity for legitimate or illegitimate gain.

HERBERT PAUL.

'WHO GOES HOME?'

AN UNDRAMATIC EPISODE

Characters

SIR JOHN HUSTLER-DIBB, BART. M.P.

JAMES STRICKLAND, M.P.

THE HON. MARY MARGETSON.

The place of action is a small room near the Terrace of the House of Commons. The time is the afternoon of a day very late in the Session. Enter MISS MARGETSON and STRICKLAND to begin.

MISS M. (*talking as she comes in*). I hope I haven't kept you waiting, Mr. Strickland.

STRICKLAND. Oh, it's of no consequence, now you are here.

MISS M. You thought I wasn't coming?

STRICKLAND. I had almost begun to.

MISS M. What would you have done if I hadn't?

STRICKLAND. I don't know! Been offensive to the next person who spoke to me, I suppose.

MISS M. Well, I wasn't sure that I meant to come, till the last moment. • Tea at the House is quite the thing, of course; only I ought to have brought some one with me, you know.

STRICKLAND. If you had, I should have had to listen to her chatter all the time.

MISS M. Oh, that will be the same with the other women you expect.

STRICKLAND. But I don't expect any.

MISS M. Then what has become of your tea-party?

STRICKLAND. It's here. We are the party.

MISS M. (*a little uneasily*). No one else!

STRICKLAND. Yes, there's one other. Hustler-Dibb has promised to run in and swallow a cup of tea with us. He's such a dreadfully busy man that he never can stay long anywhere. I told him five o'clock.

MISS M. You told me half-past four!

STRICKLAND. And you arrived at a quarter, to five. It's ten minutes to now. Do you mind waiting till the hour? (*Offering her a chair.*)

MISS M. Not at all. But why aren't we having tea on the Terrace to-day?

STRICKLAND. No one is out there, except constituents and their ladies; if it weren't for them we should have the place quite to ourselves. (*Seating himself near her.*) All the rest have flown. I wonder you didn't start for your beloved Homburg a week ago.

MISS M. My father has a board meeting to preside over to-morrow, and so we are stopping till the day after.

STRICKLAND. I'm very grateful to the company for having detained their chairman.

MISS M. Why?

STRICKLAND. Because I particularly wanted to say something to you, and I could scarcely believe my eyes when I saw you last night at the Vansittars'. I thought I should have had to come all the way out to Homburg to say it.

MISS M. It was something you couldn't write, then!

STRICKLAND. Not so well.

MISS M. Wouldn't it have kept till we came back?

STRICKLAND. Perhaps it would have been no good then.

MISS M. Well, what is this wonderful piece of news?

STRICKLAND (*earnestly*). I hope that it is not *news* to you. Women know these things by instinct, or we are told they do. Miss Margetson, you must have seen that I cared for you, and perhaps you were surprised I did not tell you so in as many words. I should have done long before, had I been in a position to ask you if you cared for me enough to throw in your lot with mine. But I wasn't, and even now I may be speaking too soon. Only I couldn't bear this uncertainty any more; I couldn't support the thought of your being surrounded by a crowd of younger men, who were free to follow your footsteps where fashion led them, and who might, at any hour of their idle day, tell you how much they admired you.

MISS M. You appear to think that I have a great many admirers, Mr. Strickland.

STRICKLAND. Not one who is as devoted to you as I am.

MISS M. (*with malice*). Or as desirable, either?

STRICKLAND. Don't mock me! I know how very undesirable I am from a worldly point of view. That is what has kept me silent. But you must not for a moment imagine that I assumed you would listen to me when I did speak.

MISS M. (*in a low tone*). I am listening.

STRICKLAND. I trusted that you might. Still, it makes me very happy to find that I have not spoken too late. You see, a man of my age doesn't open his heart unless he is at least sure of sympathy.

You have been very sympathetic to me; you have helped me, how much you cannot guess, to keep myself abreast of the stream. But then, most women are kind to a poor devil who turns to them for consolation, and I ask something more of you than pity.

MISS M. I never thought you were to be pitied, and I'm certain that other people envy you your success.

STRICKLAND. Yes! They don't know how hollow it all is. I've told you what a hard struggle it has been for me to keep my place in public life with clean hands. I had much better have stuck to my work at the Bar. Once I was vain enough to believe that I might be one of the few, the small minority, who ever reach the front bench. I am older now, though, and I don't think so well of my chances. It has dawned upon me that I am one of the many, the vast majority, who drop out of the race after a time. Therefore I am going to resign my seat.

MISS M. Oh, but you mustn't; it would be positively wicked. I feel sure they will make room for you in the Government soon. Father was dining in Downing Street a night or two ago, and the Prime Minister praised you ever so much to him.

STRICKLAND. If they really intended to do anything of that sort, it would come too late. No; the best way to rescue something from the wreck of my Parliamentary career is for me to secure a permanent post outside the House. And even this might not have occurred to me if Dibb hadn't made the suggestion.

MISS M. Why did he do it?

STRICKLAND. Well, he's under some slight obligation to me, or he thinks he is, about his being 'Barted,' you know. I sounded the Patronage Secretary in that matter for him. Of course it was arranged easily enough. They don't refuse this kind of thing to a member with fifty thousand a year, who's always ready to support the cause. But he is grateful, all the same; and very anxious to do me a good turn, if he can.

MISS M. I like him for that.

STRICKLAND. Yes; he's a trifle fussy, but he means well.

MISS M. What is the post he thinks you ought to take?

STRICKLAND. Well, the appointment for which my friends are recommending me is a county-court judgeship.

MISS M. You'd be a sort of magistrate, then?

STRICKLAND. Hardly that. But I should be quite comfortably off, and, with the little I have of my own, almost able to make some one else—comfortable.

MISS M. Only if you were happy yourself, though. And you couldn't be happy—you would never cease to regret all those things you'd turned your back upon.

STRICKLAND. If I got you in exchange, I would not regret anything.

MISS M. Ah, but I should. And I should feel that you had done this for my sake.

STRICKLAND. If it were the reality and not the shadow, I would gladly renounce it for your sake, Mary.

MISS M. How could I let you?

STRICKLAND. It is nothing compared with the sacrifice I am asking you to make. You have the whole world at your feet. And who can say how brilliant your future might not be?

MISS M. (*quietly, and with her eyes cast down*). No future would have any attraction for me in which you had not a part, Geoffrey.

STRICKLAND (*in a low tone, but with suppressed emotion*). Do you really feel that? Are you sure of yourself, dear? (*Taking her hand*.) It's almost incredible that you should place your hand in mine. I have never found words yet to tell you what happiness this would give me; I cannot find them even now. They come to me readily enough in there! (*With a gesture of the left hand*.) But no words can express the true language of the heart, and when I think of you my heart is very full. Often I have watched for you from the corner of some crowded room, and it has seemed that, if we met, my secret would burst from me in a torrent. Still, when you came, and I looked, without speaking, into your eyes, I felt that you must have known. You see, dear, I loved you so much that I could not well make love to you.

MISS M. You left that to others, who did not mean half they said; but I saw through them as easily as I understood your silence.

STRICKLAND. You can forgive me, then?

MISS M. (*with a touch of archness in her manner*). Oh, I can do that freely, now!

STRICKLAND. And you will be my wife, although I am putting ambition behind me?

MISS M. Yes, if it is your wish; if you are contented to take a lower place in the world.

STRICKLAND. I shall always be perfectly content with any place we hold together.

MISS M. And so shall I, Geoffrey.

[After a slight pause, a MAID-SERVANT enters and lays some tea-things on a table near them. When she has placed all in readiness, she retires as quietly as she came in.]

MISS M. Do you think you can face the prospect of my pouring out tea for you day after day?

STRICKLAND. Yes, if they followed one another without a break until the end of time.

MISS M. I should be quite elderly then.

STRICKLAND. You will always seem the same in my eyes; and, remember, I shall remain several years older than you till the years are lost in eternity.

[Exit MAID-SERVANT.]

MISS M. How nicely you brought that in! Yes, we like to believe that love will last for ever. But does it? Does anything last so long?

STRICKLAND. Sometimes I think it may. (*Kisses her hand.*)

MISS M. (*with a look of contemplation*). Ah! (*Then, after a slight pause, in a changed manner.*) But where's your friend? If he doesn't come soon, the tea will be cold. (*Going up towards the table.*)

[*Enter SIR JOHN rapidly, evidently in a great and unnecessary hurry, but in high good humour. He is a very small and very jussy man.*]

SIR JOHN. My dear fellow, I've been hunting for you high and low. Only just found you! I do believe I'm half a minute late. I owe you a thousand apologies!

STRICKLAND (*putting his hand on SIR JOHN'S shoulder*). Don't attempt to pay them, old man. You're a model of punctuality, as always. Let me introduce you to Miss Margetson. Sir John Hustler-Dibb.

SIR JOHN (*after bowing to her*). Charmed! I have often seen you, Miss Margetson, and our friend here has promised that he'd make me known to you at the first opportunity. (*Sitting.*) But in a busy life—

MISS M. (*pouring out the tea*). Yes, of course, Sir John! I've heard how busy you are in the House. (*Gives him a cup.*)

SIR JOHN (*taking the cup*). Thank you! It's not the House only. An M.P. has so many duties; such a number of public meetings that he must attend. And then there are private meetings, like the present, when we can find the time.

MISS M. I hope you don't find them a tie.

SIR JOHN. Far from it. They are my sole relaxation. I've been looking forward to this actual meeting for a long time. Strickland is one of my oldest friends. I am sorry I don't see more of him, but, as I said, we have so little time for social intercourse.

MISS M. Don't you see a good deal of one another in the House?

SIR JOHN. Oh, yes, we sit together. Still, the company is not quite so pleasant as one could wish.

STRICKLAND. You are right there, Dibb. I shall be glad to hear the last of some of them.

SIR JOHN. You have told Miss Margetson that you are leaving us?

MISS M. He has, Sir John. And I don't at all like the notion.

SIR JOHN. No, more do I, my dear young lady. I shall miss him terribly. But what's to be done? If these fellows on the front bench don't make way for him, we can't force them to shift. There they stick, as tight as limpets, even when the chief would like to get rid of them; and they won't be tempted to move upstairs by his dangling a coronet before their noses. So, as our friend told me that he wanted to settle down—(*with a shrewd glance at MISS MARGETSON*)—and I heard there was one of these judgeships going, I thought,

perhaps, he might do worse. I'm not sure, though, that it wouldn't be better if he waited. He's a power in the House, you know, and possibly something might happen. Then the fellow says he *won't* wait.

STRICKLAND. I *can't* wait any longer. I've waited ~~too~~ too long already.

MISS M. Oh, no!

STRICKLAND. Yes I have! I won't continue to chase a will-of-the-wisp that might lead me into a quagmire out of which my friends couldn't drag me. Ah, Dibb can tell you I am not exaggerating the danger. He has seen it all again and again. How the man people begin by patting on the back is gradually pushed to the wall. He loses his peace of mind first, then his health, and then hope; and who cares, who even notices? There's a place left empty for some duffer, that is all they know!

MISS M. Is it so bad as that, Sir John?

SIR JOHN. Every bit, my dear Miss Margetson. It's the law of life; a struggle for existence goes on just as fiercely in this House as it does outside.

STRICKLAND (*bitterly*). Yes, and the most favoured come best off here, as elsewhere. (*With a shade of anxiety in his tone.*) Do you think I shall get this thing, Dibb?

SIR JOHN. My dear fellow, I'm perfectly confident you will. That reminds me. I am to see the Lord Chancellor's secretary about the appointment this afternoon. He gave me to understand that it was all right yesterday but he said he would tell me for certain to-day. If you'll excuse me, Miss Margetson, I'll go and find him now. (*To STRICKLAND, as he turns to go.*) You may take it from me that I've left no stone unturned. (*At the door.*) I'll be back in two minutes with the good news. (*Bustles off.*)

MISS M. (*after a slight pause*). Geoffrey, are you sure Sir John has turned no stones that he had best have left alone?

STRICKLAND. It's very improbable. An over-zealous man usually does too much. But it can't do any harm; the post isn't important enough for that. Besides, Dibb has great weight in the House. You'd hardly imagine it to look at him; nevertheless, he has. Fifty thousand a year always did carry weight at Westminster!

[*Enter MAID-SERVANT who clears away the tea-things, and then goes off with them.*]

MISS M. Does he speak often?

STRICKLAND. Never, now; but he still votes.

MISS M. He seemed rather talkative.

STRICKLAND. He is, very. Only so are many others, and the members who don't want to talk are the worst listeners in the world. They won't listen to Dibb at all.

[*Exit MAID.*]

MISS M. They always listen to you.

STRICKLAND. Yes; then I don't speak unless I have something to say.

MISS M. Oh, I see!

STRICKLAND (*who is in a state of nervous excitement*). And I say the thing they think. For instance, I never appeal to their sense of justice. That figure is all very well for a court of law; but it is far too crude for the House. We are ruled by compromise, the goddess with the evenly balanced scales, who gives fair value for an adequate consideration. If ever we introduce any reform, we are very careful to point out the consideration; and, above all, we assure ourselves that the vested interests remain undisturbed. Why, I believe, should Parliament be sitting when the last trump sounds, that it will record a hasty vote of protest against this disturbance of the vested interests.

MISS M. But my father says they are only preserved by the House of Lords.

STRICKLAND. With all respect, that is a delusion on the part of Lord Montbarb. It's founded on a polite fiction, in which the House of Commons has a vested interest.

[*Enter SIR JOHN, still in a hurry, but no longer with the same cheerful and confident manner.*]

SIR JOHN (*calling Strickland aside, as he comes in*). My dear fellow, a word with you! I really don't know how to look you in the face.

STRICKLAND (*speaking in a hoarse whisper*). I haven't got it!

SIR JOHN (*greatly troubled*). It would seem not! I don't understand why, yet; but I'll find out.

STRICKLAND. Pray don't take the trouble, it's no use now! (*With obvious sincerity.*) I'm very much obliged to you, Dibb, as much as if you had secured the appointment for me. (*Turns back to Miss MARGETSON.*) They've given it to some one else.

MISS M. Oh, they wouldn't do that!

SIR JOHN. Exactly my view, Miss Margetson. I'm afraid they have, though. I feel myself to blame; still, I don't know where I went wrong. Everything was in order, we had a committee on it, and the Treasury people had promised to back us up. Besides, Strickland's services were a more than sufficient claim, and we have taken steps to draw attention to them in the proper quarters.

STRICKLAND (*with meaning*). I suppose the other fellow had a stronger claim than mere services.

SIR JOHN (*nodding his head*). Possibly. We don't know who he is yet; but before the appointment is gazetted I shall make representations.

STRICKLAND. It won't be any good, Dibb. One can't bring pressure to bear in these matters; it would never do.

MISS M. Isn't there some other post he might have, Sir John?

SIR JOHN. I don't know of a vacancy at present. They keep

these things so deuced close. But you can rely on me, old chap, if anything should turn up.

STRICKLAND. Thank you, Dibb.

SIR JOHN. Don't thank me: I don't deserve it. I've made a mess of this somehow, and yet for the life of me I can't see how. I put it forward as a personal favour, and I've never been refused anything.

STRICKLAND. Well, we can't always win.

SIR JOHN. I suppose not; but I wanted to win this time very much. After what you did for me, Strickland, I can't bear to fail you at a pinch.

STRICKLAND. You did your best, old man.

SIR JOHN. Yes, I tried hard. My only misgiving was that the thing wouldn't be good enough for you. And I don't think it would have been, either. (*An electric bell is heard to ring continuously, and a voice off calls 'Division!'*) Hallo, division! The House will be up after this. We have to rush away for a few minutes, Miss Margetson. (*Moves towards the door.*)

MISS M. Please don't let me detain you.

SIR JOHN. Aren't you coming, Strickland?

STRICKLAND. No; I'm paired. (*Sinking into a seat.*)

SIR JOHN. Lucky man! I'm not, and I must put this in, if I'm to keep up my record. (*Turning when he reaches the door.*) Don't lose heart. We'll get you something better before long. (*Goes off in a great hurry.*)

[*The bell now stops ringing.*]

MISS M. I am very sorry, Geoffrey; still, it may not be so bad, after all. You heard what he said? They will get you something better soon.

STRICKLAND (*resting his head on his hands*). Not soon enough. I'm done, Mary. You don't know the reason that drove me to snatch at this straw like a drowning man. It's so petty, so sordid. I've tried to keep it from you, but I must tell you now. They have sucked me dry. I can't remain in the House any longer. I haven't enough money.

MISS M. Does it take very much?

STRICKLAND. Not much for a chap like Dibb, but more than I can afford. No man with a limited income can meet the ever-increasing calls that his constituency makes on him year after year unless he is helped by the party, and I couldn't bring myself to accept that. Of course, it is nobody's fault. People have been taught to regard their members as well-to-do, and few of us have the courage to combat the idea. Indeed, it would only ensure our defeat, in most cases, if we did. It has always been easier for a rich man to get into the kingdom of heaven than for a poor one to get into the House of Commons. So we go on yielding to the constant

demand upon our purse, until we reach the end of our resources, and then we *drop out of the race*.

MISS M. But you won't do that—not yet, at least; you'll hold on a little longer.

STRICKLAND. I think not. I must stop while there's time to start afresh. It'll be a wrench to leave this place, where I have centred so many hopes; but I shall scarcely notice that, since it will be as nothing to the pain of parting from you, Mary.

MISS M. What do you mean, Geoffrey?

STRICKLAND. Don't you see, dear? Don't you understand? I could not be so downcast on my own account. I should go back to practice with a light heart, although it'll be an uphill fight now, if I only had myself to think of. No; it's because I cannot ask you to wait until I have my feet under me again that I feel this blow so bitterly.

MISS M. Why shouldn't I wait, dear? I have waited patiently for you to declare yourself, and now that I am sure of you I don't care how long I have to wait.

STRICKLAND. Because my life is a failure, I can't allow you to spoil yours too.

MISS M. My life is my own, to do with as I choose.

STRICKLAND. But you are bound to make the best of it, dear.

MISS M. It will be worthless if I lose you.

STRICKLAND. Don't say that! Don't think it! You'll only make it so much the harder for me to do what's right. I find that hard enough as it is. If I were young, and had the world before me, I would hold you to your word. But would it be fair to let you throw yourself away on a man whose future was so uncertain as mine?

MISS M. Why can't we work together for your future? Why can't I come to you and help you, Geoffrey? I could write your letters for you instead of the person who does them now.

STRICKLAND (*smiling*). But she takes them down in shorthand, and then types them.

MISS M. (*with a brave attempt at self-confidence*). Well, I'm sure I could learn typewriting. I knew a girl once who did; and I might try to learn shorthand as well, perhaps.

STRICKLAND (*drily*). Perhaps! It would scarcely be worth your while, though. The girl only does my Parliamentary work, and I must get rid of her now, poor thing.

MISS M. I'm glad of that. I never liked to see her hanging about you.

STRICKLAND. Fancy your objecting to that child. She has no existence outside her work, and she is hard at it from morning till night.

MISS M. I could work for you just as hard as she does.

STRICKLAND (*tenderly*). My darling, do you think I could permit you to waste your youth and freshness on such drudgery as that? You would have been badly enough off even if they had appointed me; but, as things are, our lives must lie apart.

MISS M. Geoffrey, suppose there really were something better in store for you? Just now you said that 'we can't always win.' Then why give up hope after a single rebuff?

STRICKLAND. Because I feel that it is final. If I had asked for some great post, one of the blue-ribbons, it wouldn't have mattered. In official parlance, it would *have done me no harm*. But to be refused anything small means that they require your support no longer, and have forgotten the services you have rendered in the past.

MISS M. They can't be so ungrateful.

STRICKLAND. My dear Mary, there is no such thing as collective gratitude. This is a commonplace of public life, and sooner or later great men find out its truth, as surely as small people like myself. My services were valued by the party leaders while they lasted, and that was just so long as we remained in opposition. I had plenty of encouragement then to take a prominent part in debate. Our First Whip would put his hand on my shoulder and say, 'Strickland, old chap, we depend on you to-night.' Or I would get a note from the chief himself, begging me to look up the legal points of a Bill, in order to follow the Attorney-General on the other side. I was glad enough to do it, too, for I thought that kind of thing must lead to promotion some day. But when we came into power everything was changed. The authorities would never ask me to speak, except early in the evening, when they could find no one else, or if they wanted to avoid a count. At all other times they would implore me to be silent, and I began to see the day when I might get my first step grow farther and farther off. I didn't turn rusty, though, like some fellows; I didn't attack them from behind with questions which come from the departments marked 'Private,' and for which the permanent secretaries can supply no plausible answers. No; I was as loyal to them as the mutest hound in the whole pack, responding as cheerfully to every crack of the whip; and mark how they treat me. When I can't follow any further, the smallest favour is found too great a reward for my years of faithful service.

MISS M. I wonder how any one could have grudged you this appointment.

STRICKLAND. I don't believe that any one of them did. Individually they'd have been well enough pleased to see me get it. But they are only feeders of a great machine, that grinds on in the path of routine quite irrespective of their likes or dislikes. Few of them know even how it is set in motion, and none can stop or turn it.

MISS M. Then who controls things in the end?

STRICKLAND. No one. They are governed by the system. It has

grown up out of the custom of ages, and he that understands it is reckoned wise.

MISS M. (*smiling*). You must be very clever to know about it, then.

STRICKLAND. Oh, I have learnt by experience! A fool might do that.

MISS M. But haven't you overlooked one point?

STRICKLAND. What?

MISS M. Is there *no such thing* as influence?

STRICKLAND. Yes, but that belongs to the system.

MISS M. And how does it act?

STRICKLAND. Well, I think Lord Montbarb could better explain that to you. It's not confined to the Lower House.

MISS M. Father never explains these things to any one. I don't believe he really knows much about them himself.

STRICKLAND. Except by instinct, eh? We've all an hereditary impulse to use our best weapons of defence. And 'influence' is so admirably fashioned for this purpose that I scarcely fancy the governing classes will cast it aside yet awhile. It is so beautifully spread over the entire country, uniting all whom it reaches by so strong a bond, that I doubt whether it could be destroyed, even if it were made *visible*; and the parts of it dovetail so delightfully into one another.

MISS M. The parts?

STRICKLAND. Yes, 'influence' may be divided into three parts. They are recommendation, claims, and relationship.

MISS M. What about qualifications?

STRICKLAND. Well enough, if you have them, only they exert no influence. We assume that all candidates are equally qualified. It's the safest way of shifting our responsibility. Therefore we never put any one forward as the best man, or the most highly qualified, but always as the *very* man for the post. That sounds strong, and it commits one to nothing definite.

MISS M. Then you leave out qualifications!

STRICKLAND. Altogether. I've told you the things that really matter. Of these three, recommendation is the least, and relationship by far the greatest. But *recommendation*, which stands for little by itself, may be indirectly backed by claims, the claims of the man who recommends, and weight will be added by his relationship to the man recommended. It would then perhaps command 'serious consideration.' *Claims* should speak for themselves, only it is just as well to have them properly recommended; and, even so, they might not prevail, unless they were of the kind that cannot be ignored. You saw the converse of this in my case. Now there only remains *relationship*. Yet if we were related to the man who made the appointment, we need not trouble much about the other two factors, though both can easily be based on relationship, since this alone

gives a valid claim, and such claims always secure ample recommendation. There, my dear, I have harangued you as though you were an election meeting; but you must forgive me *for this once*, as children say. Who knows if I shall ever speak in this place again?

[Enter SIR JOHN, *breathless, and so excited that he can scarcely speak coherently, even when he has somewhat recovered.*

SIR JOHN (*having overheard the last sentence, and talking as he comes in*). Not speak again! My dear fellow (*stops to regain his breath*). You've only just *begun* to speak! Who do you think buttonholed me in the lobby, Miss Margetson? *The Prime Minister!* I was rather avoiding him, but he came over, and drew me aside. 'You're a friend of Strickland's?' he said. 'A great friend,' I replied. 'Well, I want you to do me a favour, Dibb.' He always begins like that when he's going to be extra decent. 'I'm horrified about this application of his,' he went on. 'We had no idea of it till last night. I put a stop to it at once; such a thing is quite out of the question.'

STRICKLAND. Why should it be?

SIR JOHN. Wait, wait, hear me out! 'We can't spare him,' he said; 'we want new blood in the Cabinet, and we've been talking the matter over to-day. Several names were suggested, but we decided to ask Strickland to join us. I'm afraid he was a little disappointed at not being asked before. Of course, he's sure of his seat?' 'Perfectly,' said I. 'Then you can tell him that we count on his acceptance, Dibb.'

STRICKLAND. Yes, he may count on that, eh, Mary?

MISS M. I should think so, indeed.

SIR JOHN (*with conscious self-importance*). It's a secret for the present; but you are to be — (*Whispers the words in his ear.*) Old — (*whispering again*) will take a peerage. What do you say to him now, Miss Margetson? The Right Honourable Geoffrey Strickland, P.C., one of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State! I wouldn't be surprised if he cut us all.

STRICKLAND. No fear of that, old friend. I say, though, this is a tremendous jump; they are passing me over the heads of a good many.

SIR JOHN. Well, most of them have spoiled their chances by showing the cloven foot. The chief can't stand criticism from our side; he looks on it as *treachery*.

STRICKLAND. I know.

SIR JOHN. But you have always behaved splendidly. He said so himself.

MISS M. Yes, those are the words he used to my father. I'd forgotten them when I told you how the Prime Minister praised you the other night.

STRICKLAND. And I thought he only meant to be civil to Lord Montbarb because he guessed (*looking at her*) something. It shows how utterly one can be mistaken.

MISS M. You see. Geoffrey, I was right to tell you not to give up hope.

STRICKLAND. You were, indeed, Mary, and I feel that you have brought me this piece of good fortune. Though that is nothing to the still greater happiness you bring me. (*Turning to SIR JOHN.*) Dibb, old man, let me present you to the lady who has promised to be my wife.

SIR JOHN (*cordially*). Ah, I thought as much, and I congratulate you both.

MISS M. Thank you, Sir John. I am very glad that you should be the first to do it.

STRICKLAND (*grasping his hand*). And so am I.

SIR JOHN (*in a broken tone*). Happy to have the privilege!

[*A voice is heard in the distance shouting the words 'Who goes home?'*]

MISS M. What's that?

SIR JOHN. It means that the House is up.

STRICKLAND (*proudly, now absolutely content with the existing order of things*). They have shouted those words for centuries. Men may go, parties may change, but *Parliament* remains the same.

[*Voice again heard, nearer, 'Who goes home?'*]

MISS M. (*placing her hand on STRICKLAND'S arm*). We do.

STRICKLAND. Yes, I can see you home now.

MISS M. And soon—

STRICKLAND. There will be no need. (*To SIR JOHN.*) Good-bye, old chap!

MISS M. (*as they turn to go*). Good-bye, Sir John!

SIR JOHN. Good-bye!

[*STRICKLAND and MISS MARGETSON go off together. The voice is again heard, far away, 'Who goes home?'*
And SIR JOHN slowly turns to go as the

CURTAIN FALLS.

GERALD MAXWELL.

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
AND AFTER



No. CCCLVI—OCTOBER 1906

*THE AWAKENING OF CHINA: A STREET
PLACARD FROM HUNAN*

THE province of Hunan in Central China has long been noted for the fierce and independent temper of its inhabitants. They proved their mettle in the long struggle with the Manchus at the founding of the present dynasty; and half a century ago they offered such a determined resistance to the great horde of T'ai-p'ing rebels sweeping up from the south that these were effectually beaten off and driven eastwards, where they found an easier prey in the less warlike population of the lower Yangtze. As might naturally be expected, the Hunanese have always been uncompromisingly hostile to foreigners, and, in spite of unremitting efforts, missionaries have met with very scant success in this part of the Empire. Bearing these facts in mind, we shall be all the more struck with the general fairness and moderation of the remarkable document of which a translation is offered below. Early in the present year this placard was posted up in various parts of the capital; Ch'ang-sha, besides being widely circulated in pamphlet form. Contrasted with such a fanatical outburst of hatred as the notorious 'Anti-Christian Lyrics' or other inflammatory placards of thirty years ago, it serves to indicate the great forward step which China has taken in the interval. The writer appears to be a man

of some education, despite a certain crudity, perhaps partly intentional, in the expression of his views; he obviously belongs to the same school as the Viceroy Chang Chih-tung, even if the latter, who still rules in Hupeh and Hunan, did not actually inspire the manifesto. At any rate, the frankness with which the old attitude of scornful superiority to the foreigner is here abandoned, the disinclination to impotent threats and violence, the advocacy of modern commercial and economic methods, and the insistence on the necessity of reform, all remind one of the man who refused to join in the carnival of rapine and slaughter in the year of the Boxers. The most surprising feature of the whole, however, is the glowing patriotic fervour, hitherto almost undreamt of in a Chinaman, which here and there transmutes the homely and somewhat uncouth diction into the real gold of eloquence; indeed, we even seem to catch echoes of the mighty Demosthenes, who spent himself in similar efforts to rouse his countrymen to exertion. But there is no reason to believe that the present warnings will prove equally vain. The days are already past when Europeans could talk glibly of the 'partition of China,' and every hour adds to the growth of that truly national spirit which is destined to weld China's gigantic bulk ever closer together, until, in the words of Sir Robert Hart's grim prophecy, the Chinese 'will take back from foreigners everything foreigners have taken from China; will pay off old grudges with interest; and will carry the Chinese flag and Chinese arms into many a place that even fancy will not suggest to-day.'

LET ALL MEN READ!

Alas! In our Empire of China to-day things have come to an intolerable pass. The State is fallen into great weakness and decay; the foreigners have become very dangerous; our country is being cut away piece by piece; our power is slipping from us little by little; our wealth is diminishing day by day. If at this crisis we still refuse to rouse and bestir ourselves, we shall have the misfortune of seeing our country conquered and our posterity cut off. Now I have thought out a scheme which I will put into plain and simple words and lay earnestly and anxiously before you. And you, gentle sirs, who read it, so far from treating what I say as idle talk, must understand that every single sentence is thoroughly sincere and also of the utmost importance. And having read it through, you must all remember to keep it constantly in your minds and carry its principles faithfully into practice. I will now proceed to state my scheme, clause after clause.

- I. IT MUST BE RECOGNISED THAT THE CONDITIONS PREVAILING AT THE PRESENT DAY ARE CONDITIONS THAT HAVE NEVER PREVAILED IN CHINA AT ANY PERIOD OF HER HISTORY.

In former times China—that is to say, the eighteen provinces—was what her inhabitants meant by 'the world,' and apart from these

eighteen provinces no other nation was known to exist at all. In those days, therefore, it was rare that anyone came to oppress us ; and as we on our side were not disposed to wield our authority very harshly, it came about that there was peace and an absence of all trouble. But at the present time things are very different. On the east there is the Empire of Japan, to the north there is the Empire of Russia, in the west there are the English, the French, the German, and the American nations. Of these nations, the greatest are greater than China, while the smallest are smaller than China ; but all are stronger than ourselves, and every one of them has its eyes fixed on our territory and our wealth. In view of these facts, this China of ours cannot be regarded as constituting the whole world ; it cannot even be regarded as the principal country in the world. Since conditions are no longer the same as they were in earlier days, we denizens of China must also cease clinging so desperately to the old methods which served in the past. It is necessary for you to assert your authority and quietly prepare for any emergency that may arise. Only thus will you succeed in preserving your country intact.

II. IT MUST BE REALISED THAT THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE FAMILY ARE BOUND UP WITH THE STATE—THAT IF THE STATE IS OVERTHROWN THE FAMILY WILL BE DESTROYED AND THE INDIVIDUAL WILL PERISH.

I will ask you, gentle sirs, to consider this point : At the present moment we have clothes to wear, we have food to eat, we have money to spend, we have houses to live in ; where do all these come from ? Our parents can only give us the bodies we are born with ; they cannot cut off their flesh to feed us. Our little bit of land is all we have got. The food we eat, the clothes we wear, the money we spend, the houses we live in—all depend upon that. If we had not got this land we should all perish utterly. Our bit of land, therefore, is even more important to us than our own parents. If this land passes into the possession of foreign nations, then what we eat, what we wear, what we spend, what we live in—all must fall into their hands. And if they refuse to give us food to eat, and clothes to wear, and money to spend, and houses to live in, we shall be left without any resource. At the present time the country of Annam is enslaved by France, and its inhabitants must pay money in order to have clothes to their backs, they must pay in order to feed their pigs, they must pay in order to live in their houses, and those who refuse to pay are put to death. Thus, in a little while, the poor man must perish, and the rich man must in a little while become poor. Only ten years have passed since the conquest of Annam, yet already seven-tenths of her people have perished. Now see what a danger it is to have these foreigners in China ! If we are in this plight even before our country has been conquered, once conquered and enslaved, we shall surely be in the same condition as

Annam. Howbeit, there are still some grounds for hope, and therefore I humbly exhort you, sirs, to take a clear view of the situation ; and, after thinking it over, you will come to see that in protecting the State one is really protecting oneself and one's family. You cannot go on doing as you have done hitherto—only considering the family and the individual without considering the State. You must at all costs cease aiming only at selfish ends and private advantage, and rather look upon all affairs which concern the State as a whole as though they were your own personal affairs, furthering them with all your might. For if you fail in preserving the State from harm, then most assuredly you will also fail in preserving your own persons and your own homes.

III. IT MUST BE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE OVERTHROW OF THE STATE AT THE PRESENT DAY IS SOMETHING QUITE DIFFERENT FROM A CHANGE OF DYNASTY IN TIMES GONE BY. -

In former changes of dynasty, our new rulers were always our own countrymen ;¹ their speech was the speech which we understood, and their outward appearance was the same as ours. Nor did they ever bring in a new population from outside ; the country still remained *our* country, the people in it were still *our* people. We call this only a change of dynasty ; we do not call it the overthrow of the State. Nowadays, when a State is overthrown, it is not at all like this. For these foreign countries have peoples of their own, whose speech we do not understand, and whose outward appearance is not like ours. If these foreigners succeed in conquering our country, they will gradually bring their own people over here, while as for the Chinese inhabitants, they will slowly but surely kill them off. This is entirely different from a change of dynasty in former times, where submission might be followed by allegiance to the new Sovereign. For these men from foreign States who come to our land of China are not aiming at the imperial throne ; what they are aiming at is to seize land. Because in their native countries the population is large and land is scanty, their special purpose in coming to China is to seek out land. It is only land they want, land, and not by any means to become Emperor over you. When once the land has passed into their hands, they will seize all the power and control. At the present time India is under the dominion of England, who pays fixed salaries to the several Indian princes, but keeps all the real power in her own hands. As for the masses of India, they can be put to death and they can be hacked to pieces at the Englishman's pleasure. Whatever extremity of suffering you may be prepared to undergo, he will never relax his grip until you are exterminated.² You, sirs, looking at the sub-

¹ Cf. Byron : 'A tyrant !—but our masters then
Were still, at least, our countrymen.'

² Cf. Horace : 'Non missura cutem nisi plena cruoris hirudo.' Truly our reputation for bull-dog tenacity has reached the Chinaman in no very pleasant form !

jection of India, may well pity the fate of her people. And if we will not make ourselves strong in good time, but wait until our country has been reduced to slavery, how are we to avoid becoming a second India?

IV. METHODS OF PROTECTING THE STATE MUST BE ASCERTAINED AND APPLIED.

There are various methods of protecting the State, but we will only indicate now a few of the most important.

(1) *Education*.—All persons belonging to foreign nations, whether they be rich or poor, male or female, scholars, farmers, artisans, or traders,³ possess a very large stock of education. Not one of them but can read the books which are read by our students of twenty. I would ask you, sirs, to observe the foreign women whom you constantly meet in the province of Hunan; you will see that they carry volumes with them when they take their walks abroad. This is a sure proof that foreign women study books, whence it may reasonably be concluded that not a single foreigner is destitute of education. Moreover, their education is of the kind which is profitable to the State, because there is no branch of it that cannot be put to practical use. For their artisans there are technical schools; the steamship, the electric telegraph, fire-arms, cannon and other mechanical contrivances—all these are the product of technical schools. For tillers of the soil there are agricultural colleges, where you may learn that by the use of machinery for ploughing and by the use of chemicals as manure an acre of land can be made to yield four times its usual crop. For traders there are mercantile institutes, for soldiers there are military academies, for magistrates and judges there are schools of law, for those who study moral science there are various courses of training in ethics and philosophy in general. How unlike our system in China! where the only object of education is the composition of elegant essays and poetry, while the facts and conditions of actual human life are utterly ignored. Even goodness and virtue are conspicuous by their absence; we think only of riches and rank. Men that have reached eminent positions use their influence to corrupt the courts of justice, while those who become Government officials are avaricious and oppress the people. Those, on the other hand, who fail to attain high honours and to enter official life are unfit to carry loads across their shoulders or to labour with their hands; they cannot earn a single bowl of rice. Tell me, gentle sirs, of what use to the State is this sort of book-learning? In the world of the present day how can education on these lines stand against that of foreign nations? Modern education, therefore, is something different from this. We must strive to bring out the true features of the teaching of our Master Confucius; we must also pick out and study the good points in foreign

³ The four classes in China, recognised by the earliest classical books.

systems. The 'six arts' of which Confucius spoke are ceremonies, music, archery, charioteering, letters, and calculating. Archery and charioteering have reference to the art of war, and mean, in modern terms, that we must practise drilling and physical exercises. Calculating stands for mathematical science, and hence nowadays we must study mathematics. Such branches of learning as the science of right conduct and the cultivation of one's moral nature, and the theories of sound and music, which are taught in modern schools—these are what Confucius meant by ceremonies and music. Such subjects of study as the classics, history, and political economy are what he meant by letters. Thus, although we were now to stop making essays and poetry, we should nevertheless have really succeeded in bringing to light the true import of Confucius' teaching. Again, by studying natural science in our schools, we should at the same time be adopting advantageous features from the foreign system and following the principle enunciated in the 'Great Learning,'¹ that 'the perfecting of knowledge depends upon the investigation of things.' Therefore you, sirs, must understand that the present objects and motives of study are not the same as those in days gone by. It is in case I should not make my meaning clear to you, and you should imagine that in learning from foreigners and in reading foreign books we were actually yielding and submitting to foreigners—it is on this account that I am explaining myself in detail for your better comprehension, trusting that thus you will understand me clearly. And when you do understand, I want those of you who have money to subscribe for the purpose of opening a number of schools throughout the country; and I want those of you who have education to go forth and train school-teachers. It is essential that every man shall be imbued with the idea of helping his country; and it must be the object of his efforts to hasten the advent of a day when not a single individual of either sex, be he rich or poor, scholar, farmer, artisan, or trader, shall be destitute of education. If this is achieved, all will be well. For when that time has come, the men from foreign nations will surely seek to curry favour with us of their own accord, nor will they dare to come and insult us any more.

(2) *Military Strength*.—The rule in the greater part of the world to-day is that the weak are oppressed by the strong. And on this account, while the strong prosper, the weak must go to the wall. Now, gentle sirs, I wish you to observe that this principle is exemplified throughout the length and breadth of our own country. For, supposing a strong man oppresses a weak one, the latter, being in a humble station, finds that the gentry and the village elders connive at the injustice; while the former, being in an exalted position, knows that he can get the officials to stop all proceedings for redress. Among ourselves, however, there still remains the resource of appealing to the

¹ A short treatise in the Confucian canon.

principle of right; whereas, if our State is oppressed by another State, there can be no resort to any such argument, and there only remains the arbitrament of arms. The side, then, that comes off victor is right, and the side that suffers defeat is wrong.* Now this principle is well understood by foreign nations. They have laid down a law by which all men must serve in the army, so that even a king's son must serve for three years as a soldier. We in China must do the same in the future, and the result will be good. The military strength of the Chinese is good in quality as it is vast in quantity. The great drawback is that people will not give their whole minds to the subject. For, out of regard to the common saying that 'no good son of Han will go a-soldiering,' there are a great many who refuse to pay serious attention to military matters; and thus it is that the strength of China is decaying day by day. It follows that we must now begin to occupy ourselves with the subject in real earnest—forming volunteer corps, practising boxing, singlestick, musketry, and shooting with heavy artillery, entering the standing army to follow a soldier's profession, joining military colleges to study and practise the art of war. Every citizen must have military training. And only when we are able to fight foreign nations may we count ourselves a powerful State. The strength of Japan is derived from the patriotism which pervades all her people, and also from the fact that she has always had many able officers, skilled in the art of making war. That is why she defeated China in 1894, and has also recently defeated Russia. This shows that military strength lies at the root of the safety of a State. The only thing needful is to lay hold of this principle, that, whereas in former times we used military strength only to safeguard our individual persons and our individual homes, nowadays we must use it to safeguard the State as a whole. This is a point that ought to be very carefully borne in mind. Never for a moment should it be forgotten.

(3) *Unbinding the Feet.*—The custom of foot-binding is an extremely pernicious custom. There is no other country in the world where the women have their feet bound; it is only we Chinamen who are fond of bound feet. Therefore we must begin unbinding them without delay. Foot-binding has absolutely nothing which can be said in its favour. Its ostensible object is to make girls nice in appearance, but in reality it causes evils which are destructive to the State. In foreign countries everybody, irrespective of sex, does work of some sort. But in China, out of a population of 400 millions, there are 200 million women who undergo a process of maiming which unfits them for doing any work.⁵ In rich families this is all very well. But if a poor man takes a wife with small feet, he must do the hardest of manual labour and take home the money he earns

* This is a slightly exaggerated estimate; all the Manchu and Hakka women, besides those of the boating population at Canton and elsewhere, have unbound feet.

to feed his wife, who sits there doing nothing. It is exactly as though he had to support an aged mother! There are a great many men who, having wives, are personally interested in this question, and cannot afford to relax their efforts for reform. If their feet were not bound, wives would be able to help their husbands in their toil. This alone would be reason enough for the change. But, further, one must consider that the world cannot always enjoy peace; and if one fine day a licentious soldiery were to appear on the scene, how should these poor women, who find it difficult to walk a single step, do anything but sit still and await their doom? Moreover, women whose feet are bound cannot but be physically weak, and when they come to bear children these cannot be robust and strong. If in the present generation we still persist in keeping up a custom of this kind, it is nothing less than an attempt at self-destruction. Therefore, my countrymen, I warn you to cease foot-binding immediately, and thus avoid the calamity of seeing the destruction of our Empire and the extirpation of our race. This course of action can only redound to the happiness and prosperity of all.

(4) *Abstinence from Opium*.—That opium-smoking is injurious everybody is well aware, so I need not argue the question at any length, but will only point out that the foreigners who sell opium for Chinese consumption do not take opium themselves; whence it must be patent to all that this opium is stuff which should not be taken.*

I have ventured to compose a few lines of doggerel on the subject, which I want you to hum over to yourselves :

Humbly I would warn opium-smokers not to fuddle themselves in this way;
 Fuddled and stupid, they are truly objects to excite indignation!
 The wealthy man who takes opium is inclined to sleep early in the day;
 The head of the house, he loves money that is got without any toil.
 The poor man who takes opium finds it impossible to earn his living;
 A prey both to cold and to hunger—truly he is an object of compassion!
 The official who takes opium is neither pure nor incorruptible;
 His reputation is destroyed and he is hated by the people.
 The man of leisure who takes opium loses his moral sense;
 He brings wrongful influence to bear on the course of justice, and incurs the
 odium of other men.
 The artisan who takes opium finds no one who will offer him work;
 There being no road open to him wherever he turns, he abandons himself to
 his craving for the drug.
 The peasant who takes opium lets his fields run to waste;
 His harvest turns out badly and his household falls into distress.
 The scholar who takes opium forfeits his good name,
 And no man will engage him as teacher or accountant.
 The merchant who takes opium finds his affairs become embarrassed;
 Other men earn profits while he encroaches on his capital.
 I hereby warn you one and all; abstain, abstain, abstain!

* Since these lines went to press, an Imperial edict has been issued ordering the abolition of the use of opium, both foreign and native, within ten years.

Henceforth do not squander your substance in opium dens and run into debt. Rather save the money you would spend on opium, and get yourself clothes to your back ;

Then you will be nice and warm, and your mind too will be at ease.

Save the money you would spend on opium, and buy meat for your table ;

Then, though you may not be rich, you will still be rich enough.

Save the money you would spend on opium, and with it support your parents ;

Filial piety such as this is truly without compare.*

Save the money you would spend on opium, and with it help the poor ;

Charitable works of this description are verily inexhaustible in their scope.

Save the money you would spend on opium, and use it to defray public expenses ;

For if the State is wealthy and the army strong, we never need fear a foe.

In opium there lurks not poverty alone, in opium there is death !

Rouse then all your energy and show yourselves true sons of Han.

If still you do not repent and will not abstain from opium,

You shall presently lose your country and your lives !

(5) *Union in the Body Politic.*—A united body means the joining of many men's strength to make a single strength, and the joining of many wills to make a single will. Take as an illustration the trunk of a tree, which one man alone cannot lift, though a number of men together are able to do so. A number of men like this form a single united body. Again, we may compare them to a bundle of chopsticks fastened tightly together ; if one chopstick is pulled out, the whole bundle is thereby loosened. Therefore in a united body there must be no defaulter. Now in the present state of affairs success is not to be achieved by some few hundreds or thousands of men. Nothing less is necessary than that the 400 millions of us shall join together to form one vast united body ; then only can our task be accomplished. When we fought Japan in the year 1894, our soldiers joined and left the ranks at their pleasure. Consequently we suffered defeat, the island of Formosa was lopped off from the Empire and annexed by Japan, and we had to pay Japan a large indemnity to boot—all this because we made the mistake of not being united. Therefore, gentle sirs, I humbly exhort you, one and all, to coalesce and form a united body that so you may achieve your ends. Whatever these may be—the opening of schools, the promotion of industries, the development of mines, the building of railways, waging war with foreign nations, or any other sort or kind of business—you must act with a single heart and united strength, and there must not be one defaulter among you. As for the method of effecting this close union, it consists, above all, in reciprocal affection. Let a man but be a fellow-Chinaman, you must look upon him in the light of a brother. If your neighbour is in trouble, you must hasten to help him out. Then, some other day, if you yourself are in difficulties, assuredly others will come all the faster to your aid.

(6) *The Construction of Railways and the Opening up of Mines.*—These two things—railways and mines—form the bedrock of a country's

wealth and military power. Railways may be likened to arteries and sinews, and mines may be likened to treasure-houses. In arteries there must be circulation and communication in order that the body may have life; and treasure-houses must be thrown open and exploited in order that their contents may find their way into use. Now in China there are many railways that ought to be built, and there are many mines that ought to be opened, all of which still remain unopened and unbuilt. Foreigners, seeing this neglect on our part, are all anxious to come and do the work for us. They want to come and build railways, they want to come and open mines. At the present moment they have already begun to work a number of our mines, and they have laid a number of railway lines, whereas the mines that we ourselves have opened and the railways that we ourselves have laid are confined to a very few places. You, sirs, who behold these mines being exploited by foreigners and these railways being laid down by foreigners, do you not realise that in some sort our treasure-houses are being rifled and our arteries and sinews being plucked out? How, then, in future years are we to live? Nowadays the wealth and power of a nation depend on the mines it has opened up, and on the railways it has built. For mines, once opened, are the source of inexhaustible riches, and when railways have been built you can travel about the country by means of locomotives, covering more than a thousand *li*⁷ in a single day, which for traders is most convenient and useful. Moreover, when troops are needed to fight against an enemy, they can be brought up in this way with much greater rapidity. For these reasons the land in foreign countries is covered with a network of railways, and we in China must construct a similar network. Where no lines are yet laid, we must go and lay them without delay; and as for those which have already been laid by foreigners, we must buy them back again without loss of time. If you neglect to take these measures and allow the foreigners to go on building, they will construct lines of railway to their own part of the world, and their own merchants will monopolise all the business, so that our working-men here in China will have no chance of earning a cent, and our boatmen too will find their occupation gone. Moreover, railway connection having been thus established, bodies of soldiers will also be dispatched hither, nominally for the purpose of guarding the railway; but in reality these troops will have come to reduce your country to subjection. And when one fine day they make a hostile movement, we shall find ourselves unprepared to oppose them. Therefore from this time forward we must on no account whatever concede to foreigners the privilege of building these railways, but instead of that we must at once issue shares, collect capital, and go and build them ourselves. Let us not hesitate an instant, and all may yet be well.

⁷ A *li* is about one-third of a mile.

(7) *Working in Peace and Harmony.*—There are people in this country who say that foreigners should not be allowed to come and preach their religion in China. There are others who say that foreigners should not be allowed to come and carry on their trade in China, because these things lead to trouble and annoyance in a number of ways. Such sentiments, inasmuch as they aim at safeguarding the State and the future of our race, are honest enough sentiments at bottom, only they betray a certain lack of insight and understanding. At the present day there is communication between all parts of the world, including commercial intercourse and religious propaganda. This is not confined to our own country; but is the same in all. If, then, we prohibit others from coming to China, we set ourselves in opposition to the common law of all nations. And China, large as she is, is not a match for all the other nations of the world. Besides, when we want to go and trade in foreign countries, they freely permit us to do so; or, if we want to preach there the doctrines of Confucius, still they make no objection. And, indeed, at the present time there are a great many of our countrymen who have gone abroad for purposes of trade; while, as regards Confucianism, it is only because our methods of disseminating doctrines are unlike foreign methods that no missionaries of ours are sent abroad. But of late years thousands of our fellow-countrymen have gone abroad to be educated; yet never in a single instance have they been refused admittance. The question of the survival or destruction of our Empire depends on whether we make ourselves strong or remain weak. If we are able to make ourselves strong, how can the rest of the world ever hope to subdue us? But if we choose to remain weak, we must in the end fall a prey to others. This is a fixed and immutable law. Therefore, gentle sirs, I humbly exhort you to set to work with the earnestness of purpose which I recommended above. If only we are able to make ourselves sufficiently strong, there need be no fear of foreign men coming to oppress us. If, on the other hand, we absolutely neglect all means of acquiring strength, and take refuge in arrogance and violent deeds, killing and injuring foreigners until at last they come with large armies, and we are compelled to leave the fray and make ourselves scarce, not daring to show our heads, but letting the enemy wreak their vengeance on our lands,—then it may truly be said that we have been the cause of our own ruin! To sum up, then, what should be our attitude towards the foreigner? In the first place we must not be afraid of him; in the second place we must not attack nor injure him. Whatever the affair in hand may be, our only way is to discuss the rights of the case with him in a quiet and friendly spirit. This is what I mean by working together in peace and harmony. But if by any chance the rights of a case will not yield to reason and argument—if we find our opponents meditating a hostile move, and about to act as aggressors by bringing

an armed force against us, then indeed I would bid you cast life and death to the winds, and fight to the last drop of your blood—ay, though the war thus begun should endure for ten long years, though the tale of slain should have to be reckoned in millions, you must never quit the struggle—never, never! ⁸ Then, in good sooth, you may proudly call yourselves a nation.

The above paragraphs all set forth certain methods of rousing yourselves into action. Only let these be adopted, and when put into practice they will prove efficacious. The area of Japan is not greater than that of the single province of Ssü-ch'uan, its population is not more numerous than that of the single province of Hunan.⁹ Twenty years ago, as compared with China, Japan was very poor and weak; but now, having been stirred into activity, it has grown to be a rich and powerful State. India, both in size and population, is not so very far behind China; but because as a nation she was incapable of making an effort, she has fallen under the dominion of England. In the light of these facts it behoves you, sirs, to be neither downcast nor yet too light-hearted. What you must do is immediately to begin girding yourselves for action. If you can manage to do this, though your country were as small as Japan, you can still become rich and powerful. But if you are unequal to the effort, then, although your country is as great as India, you must inevitably succumb. Sirs, I humbly beseech you, from this time onward, aided by these methods which have been shown to you, begin to bestir yourselves in good earnest. Oh, happy then the day for you who read these words, for ourselves, and for the State!

LIONEL GILES.

⁸ Lord Chatham's famous words have here influenced the form, though not the substantial accuracy, of the translation.

⁹ Another rhetorical exaggeration. The population of Japan is, according to the most recent estimate, nearly double that of Hunan.

THE VILLAGE DEITIES OF SOUTH INDIA

It has been well said, by the most illustrious traveller who has lately visited India, that there is need of a truer sympathy between the peoples of India and their English rulers ; but sympathy is the child of knowledge, and we cannot truly sympathise with the mass of the villagers, who form 90 per cent. of the whole population, without some knowledge of the religious ideas and sentiments which so largely influence their lives and characters. For religion has always been in India the main interest of life, taking the place of politics, science, history, and art among the peoples of Europe. Of these in the literature of India there is nothing. The two great Epic poems are essentially bound up with the religious feelings and beliefs of the people, and the best thought of India has been devoted to religious philosophy. If we would know, then, what manner of people our fellow-subjects in India are, we must try to thread our way through the complicated maze of their religious ideas.

In the following article I will try to describe briefly one important feature of the religion of the masses. Out of the 300,000,000 inhabitants of India about 200,000,000 are Hindus, some 55,000,000 Mahommedans, and the rest Christians, Sikhs, Jains, Parsis, Jews, and Animists. Hinduism, then, is in India the religion of the masses. But it must not be supposed that Hinduism is, like Christianity or Mahommedanism, a single religion with a definite creed. On the contrary, it is a conglomerate of beliefs and customs belonging to different ages and expressing often inconsistent ideas and sentiments. We may roughly divide it into three main forms of religion. First, there are the six systems of Hindu philosophy, of which the most popular is Vedantism, a subtle and refined form of Pantheism, which forms the creed of a small and educated minority. Secondly, there is the popular worship of Siva and Vishnu, Siva representing the destructive power of nature, and Vishnu its power of preservation. This is not the ancient religion of the Vedas, the sacred books of the Hindus, but a comparatively modern form of worship that originated about the time of the decay and extermination of Buddhism between the first and sixth centuries A.D., and represents a combination of the abstract philosophical ideas of the Aryan Brahmins with the

grosser forms of worship of the original inhabitants of India. It is the form of Hinduism which is most *en évidence* and with which English people in India are most familiar. The large temples in town and village are nearly all dedicated to Siva or Vishnu, and a traveller, who visited India and saw only the surface of the religious life of the Hindus, would naturally imagine that this worship of Siva and Vishnu, with its various ramifications, formed the sum total of popular Hinduism. But in South India there is a third element in Hinduism, which is just as important as the worship of Siva and Vishnu, and has its roots deeper down in the thoughts and feelings of the masses, viz. the worship of village deities. Every village in South India is believed by the people to be surrounded by evil spirits, who are always on the watch to inflict disease and misfortunes on the unhappy villagers. They lurk everywhere, on the tops of the palmyra trees, in caves and rocks, in ravines and chasms. They fly about in the air, like birds of prey, ready to pounce down upon any unprotected victim; and the villagers pass through life in constant dread of these invisible enemies. At the same time each village has also its guardian spirit or spirits, whose function it is to ward off evil spirits and protect the villagers from epidemics of cholera, small-pox, cattle disease, famine, and all the manifold ills that flesh is heir to in an Indian village. The sole object of the worship of these village deities is to propitiate them and put them in a good temper, so as to ensure their protection or avert their wrath. There is hardly any trace of praise or thanksgiving, or any expression of gratitude and love in the whole system, and no desire for moral and spiritual blessings. The one great object of all the rites and ceremonies is to get rid of epidemics or to obtain material prosperity. The worship, therefore, in most villages only takes place occasionally. In some there is an annual sacrifice; but in the majority sacrifices are only offered when an epidemic or cattle disease breaks out. The general attitude of the villager towards his village deities is 'let sleeping dogs lie'; so long as everything goes on well and there is no disease afflicting man or beast, it seems safest to let them alone; but when misfortune comes, it is a sign that they are out of temper and require propitiation. While, therefore, Siva and Vishnu may be more dignified beings, with far more imposing shrines and temples, still when calamity overtakes a village, and famine, pestilence, or cattle disease makes its appearance, it is to the village deities that the whole body of the villagers turn for protection, as a more present help in trouble and as being more intimately concerned with the happiness and prosperity of the people.

The origin of this form of Hinduism is lost in antiquity; but it is quite certain that it represents a pre-Aryan religion, more or less modified in various parts of South India by Brahmanical and Aryan influence. There are three special features of the system which broadly distinguish it from the worship of Siva and Vishnu. (1) First,

the village deities, with very few exceptions, are female. Siva and Vishnu are male deities, and their wives are distinctly subordinate to them. On the other hand, nearly all the village deities are goddesses, though they have male attendants who guard their shrines and carry out their commands. In the Telugu country there is a male deity called 'Potu-Razu, or the Royal Man, who figures sometimes as the husband and sometimes as the brother of the goddesses; and in the Tamil country there is in almost every village a deity called Iyenar, who acts as guardian and night watchman, and is supposed to patrol the village every night, with flowing locks and flaming eyes, mounted on ghostly steeds, to scare away the evil spirits. (2) Then, secondly, the village deities are propitiated with animal sacrifices. No animal sacrifices are offered to Siva or Vishnu; but to the village deities buffaloes, sheep, goats, pigs, and fowls are freely offered, sometimes by the thousand. In some places as many as ten thousand animals will be sacrificed in a single day. In the Tamil country, where brahman influence is strong and the shedding of blood is therefore discredited, the animals are sometimes offered to the male attendants, instead of to the goddesses themselves, and a curtain is drawn before the images of the goddesses to prevent their seeing the killing of the victims; and no animal sacrifices are ever offered to Iyenar. But it is clear that these are later modifications of the system, and that originally all village deities were worshipped with animal sacrifices. (3) Then, thirdly, the pujaris, i.e. the men who perform the sacrifices and officiate as priests, are not Brahmans. The priestly caste in Hindu society is the brahman caste, and in the temples of Vishnu and Siva all the ceremonies are performed by brahman priests; but the priests of the village deities are drawn from all castes except that of the Brahmans, and in the Telugu and Canarese countries an important part of the sacrifices is taken even by the outcaste Pariahs. In the more primitive villages, where primitive customs still prevail, it is remarkable how great a number of people take an official part in the periodical sacrifices; the potter, the carpenter, the toddy-drawer,¹ the washerman, the Kurnam or magistrate, and the different sections of the Pariahs all have their appointed parts to play; and, in striking contrast to the Aryan worship controlled by the Brahmans, the worship of the village deities is marked by a conspicuous absence of sacerdotalism.

Names and Festivals.—The names of the village deities are legion, and some of them are quite unintelligible to the people themselves, but many of them have meanings which show clearly the close connection of the deities with country life, e.g. 'the Village Goddess,' 'the Great Mother,' 'the Little Mother,' 'the Water Goddess,' 'the Goddess who presides over Buttermilk,' 'the Goddess who sits under a Mango Tree,' 'the Goddess of the Cart,' &c. One of the deities universally

¹ Toddy is an intoxicating drink made from the juice of palmyra trees.

worshipped in the Tamil country is Mari-amman, the goddess of small-pox, who both inflicts and chases away this dread disease.

The symbols of the village deities are almost as diverse as their names. Sometimes there is no permanent image or symbol of the village deity at all, but a special image of clay, about two feet high, is made for each festival by the village potter; sometimes the deity is represented by a rough stone pillar standing under a tree or in the open field, sometimes by a flat slab of stone or a small conical stone not more than six inches high, sometimes by the figure of a woman carved in bas-relief upon a stone slab, and sometimes by a stone image. I saw one image in the Trichinopoly district which is typical of these more highly developed symbols. It was a stone figure of a woman, about two-and-a-half feet high, with eight arms, and in her hands a knife, a shield, a bell, a devil's head, a drum, a three-pronged fork, a goad, and a piece of rope. Very often the goddess is represented only by a brass or earthenware pot full of water, or sometimes by seven pots of different sizes piled one on the top of the other. In some villages the earthen pot is elaborately decorated. I found one filled with water, with a silver two-anna piece (2*d.*) inside, and a bunch of cocoanut leaves and oleander flowers in the mouth, surrounded by a sheaf of mango leaves, all tied together by the tender shoots of the plantain tree and then decorated with flowers and a small silver umbrella stuck on the top. In other villages an earthen pot with a looking-glass placed against it represents the deity, and in others again simply a lighted lamp. One very common symbol of the village deities is a stick or spear. In the Tamil country it is very common to see one or more iron spears stuck up under a tree to represent some village deity, and in the Telugu country Potu-Razu is nearly always represented by a wooden stick roughly carved at the top, like an attenuated bed-post.

There is no Act of Uniformity and no ecclesiastical calendar regulating the festivals or forms of worship of village deities, and no universal custom as to the appointment of pujaris (officiating priests). In some villages, where there is a permanent shrine, offerings of rice, fruit, and flowers, with incense and camphor, are made every day by the villagers, who have made vows to the goddess, through the pujari. Often offerings are made once or twice a week, on fixed days, consisting chiefly of grain, fruit, and flowers, and occasionally of goats, sheep, and fowls. In many places there is a fixed annual festival, which sometimes takes place after harvest, when the people are at leisure and well off for food. But there is no regular rule as to the time, and the custom varies widely in different districts. In most places, however, there is no regular annual festival, but a sacrifice is held whenever an epidemic or any other calamity occurs which may make it expedient to propitiate the goddess. In some villages old men have complained to me that, whereas formerly festivals were held

yearly, now, owing to the decay of religion, they are only held once in four or five years. So, again, there is no uniformity as to the duration of a festival. Generally it lasts about a week, but in the Tamil country it is sometimes a very elaborate affair, lasting for a fortnight, three weeks, or even a whole month; so too in Mysore city the Mari festival, which is held in February, lasts for about four weeks. But a long festival is an expensive luxury, which only a large town or a well-to-do village is able to afford. Speaking generally, the object of the festival is simply to propitiate the goddess and to avert epidemics and other calamities from the village, and to ward off the attacks of evil spirits.

Let us suppose that an attack of cholera or small-pox has broken out in a village of South India. We will take a village in the Telugu country, in one of the more backward districts, where life is lived under more primitive conditions than in places where large towns and railways and the influence of the Brahmans have tended to change old-fashioned ideas and customs. The village deity, in this particular village, is called Peddamma, the Great Mother. The epidemic is a sign that she is angry and requires to be propitiated. So a collection is made for the expenses of a festival, or a rich man offers to pay all expenses, and a propitious day is selected, which in this village may be any day except Sunday or Thursday. Then the potter of the village is instructed to make a clay image of the Great Mother, and the carpenter to make a small wooden cart, while a he-buffalo is chosen as the chief victim for the sacrifice. When the appointed day arrives, the buffalo is sprinkled all over with yellow turmeric, and garlands of margosa leaves are hung round its neck and tied to its horns. At about 2 P.M. it is conducted round the village in procession to the sound of music and the beating of tom-toms. The two sections of the Pariahs or outcastes, the Malas and Madigas, take the leading part in this sacrifice, and conduct the buffalo from house to house. One Madiga goes on ahead, with a tom-tom, to announce that 'the he-buffalo devoted to the goddess is coming.' The people then come out from their houses, bow down to worship the buffalo, and pour water over his feet. They then give some food to the Malas and Madigas, who form the procession. By about 8 P.M. this ceremony is finished, and the buffalo is brought to an open spot in the village, and tied up near a small canopy of cloths supported on bamboo poles, which has been set up for the reception of the goddess. All the villagers then assemble at the same place, and at about 10 P.M. they go in procession, with music and tom-toms and torches, to the house of the potter, where the clay image is ready prepared. On arriving at his house they pour about two-and-a-half measures of rice on the ground and put the image on the top of it, adorned with a new cloth and jewels. All who are present then worship the image, and a ram is killed, by cutting off its head with a large

chopper, and the blood sprinkled on the top of the image, as a kind of consecration. The potter then takes up the idol, carries it out of the house for a little distance, and gives it to a washerman, who carries it to the place where the canopy has been set up to receive it. During the procession, the people flourish sticks, swords, and spears to keep off the evil spirits, and, for the same purpose, cut limes in half and throw them up in the air. The idea is that the greedy demons will clutch at the golden limes and carry them off, and so be diverted from any attack on the man who carries the image. When the idol has been duly deposited under the canopy, another procession is made to the house of the toddy-drawer. He is the man who climbs the palm trees and draws off the juice which is made into toddy. At his house some rice is cooked, and a pot of toddy and a bottle of arrack are produced and duly smeared with turmeric and a red paste, constantly used in religious worship among the Hindus and called 'kunkuma.' The cooked rice is put in front of the pot of toddy and bottle of arrack, a ram is killed in sacrifice, and then the toddy-drawer worships the pot and the bottle. The village officials then pay him his fee, three-eighths of a measure of rice, three-eighths of a measure of cholam, and four annas. Then he carries the pot and bottle in procession, and places them under the canopy near the image of Peddamma. Then comes yet another procession. The people go off to the house of the chief official, the Reddy, and bring from it some cooked rice in a large earthenware pot, some sweet cakes, and a lamb. A large quantity of margosa leaves are spread on the ground in front of the image, the rice from the Reddy's house is placed upon them in a heap, and then a large heap of rice, from one hundred to three hundred measures, according to the amount of the subscriptions, is poured in a heap a little further away.

All these elaborate proceedings form only the preparations for the great sacrifice which is now about to begin. First the lamb is worshipped and then sacrificed by having its throat cut and its head cut off. A ram is then brought and stood over the first large heap of rice, and is there cut in two, through the back, with a heavy chopper, by one of the village washermen. The blood pours out over the rice and soaks it through. One half of the ram is then taken up and carried to a spot a few yards off, where a body of Pariah priests, called Asadis, are standing ready to begin their part in the ceremonies. The other half of the ram is left lying on the rice. The Asadis then begin to sing a long chant in honour of the deity. Meanwhile, the chief sacrifice is made. The he-buffalo is brought forward, and the Madigas kill it by cutting its throat (in some villages its head is cut off). Some water is first poured over the blood, and then the pool of blood and water is covered up carefully with earth, lest any outsider from another village should come and steal it. The idea is that, if any man from another village should take away and carry home even

a small part of the blood, that village would get the benefit of the sacrifice. The head of the buffalo is then cut off and placed before the image, with a layer of fat from its entrails smeared over the forehead and face, so as to cover entirely the eyes and nose. The right fore-leg is cut off and placed crosswise in the mouth, some boiled rice is placed upon the fat on the forehead, and on it an earthenware lamp, which is kept alight during the whole of the festival. Why the right fore-leg should be cut off and placed in the mouth, and what the origin of the ceremony is, I have never been able to discover, nor can I conjecture. When I have asked the villagers, they only reply, 'It is the custom.' But I have found the practice prevailing in all parts of South India, among Tamils, Telugus, and Canarese alike, and it is evidently a very ancient part of the ritual of sacrifice.

This completes the presentation of the sacrifice to the goddess, who is supposed to delight in the food offered, and especially in the blood. A great deal of the food supplied is, as a matter of fact, taken away by the people and eaten in their homes, but the idea is that the goddess takes the essence and leaves the worshippers the material substance. This takes till about 3 A.M. next morning, and then begins another important part of the ceremonies. Some of the rice from the heap, over which the ram was sacrificed and its blood poured out, is taken and put in a flat basket, and some of the entrails of the buffalo are mixed with it. The intestines of the lamb which was first killed are put over the neck of a Mala, and its liver is placed in his mouth, while another Mala takes the basket of rice soaked in blood and mixed with the entrails of the buffalo. A procession is then formed, with these two weird figures in the middle. The man with the liver in his mouth is worked up into a state of frantic excitement and is supposed to be inspired by the goddess. He has to be held by men on either side of him, or kept fast with ropes, to prevent his rushing away; and all round him are the Malas and other villagers, flourishing clubs and swords, and throwing limes into the air, to drive away the evil spirits. As the procession moves through the village, the people shout out 'Food! Food!' and the man who carries the basket sprinkles the rice soaked in blood over the houses to protect them from evil spirits. As he walks along he shouts out, at intervals, that he sees the evil spirits, and falls down in a faint. Then lambs are sacrificed on the spot, limes thrown into the air and cocoanuts broken, to drive away the demons and bring the man to his senses. And so the weird procession moves through the village, amid frantic excitement, till, as the day dawns, they return to the canopy, where the Great Mother is peacefully reposing. At about 10 A.M. a fresh round of ceremonies begins. Some meat is cut from the carcase of the buffalo and cooked with some grain, and then given to five little pariah boys, 'Siddhalu' or 'The Innocents,' as they are called.

They are all covered over with a large cloth, and eat the food entirely concealed from view, probably to prevent the evil spirits from seeing them, or the evil eye from striking them. And then some more food is served to the Asadis, who have been, for many hours, during the ceremonies of the night, chanting the praises of the goddess. Afterwards the villagers bring their offerings. The Brahmans, who may not kill animals, bring rice and cocoanuts, and other castes bring lambs, goats, sheep, fowls and buffaloes, which are all killed by the washermen, by cutting their throats, except the buffaloes, which are always killed by the Madigas, the lowest class of the Pariahs. The heads are all cut off and presented to the goddess. This lasts till about 3 P.M., when the people go off to the house of the village carpenter, who has got ready a small wooden cart. On their arrival, some cooked rice is offered to the cart, and a lamb sacrificed before it, and a new cloth and eight annas are given to the carpenter as his fee. The cart is then dragged by the washermen, to the sound of horns and tom-toms, to the place of sacrifice. The heads and carcasses of the animals already sacrificed are first removed by the Malas and Madigas, except the head of the buffalo first offered, which remains in its place till all the ceremonies are finished. The shrine is then removed, and at about 7 P.M. another series of ceremonies begins. First a lamb is sacrificed before the goddess, and its blood mixed with some cooked rice, and at the same time a pig is buried, up to the neck, in a pit at the entrance of the village, with its head projecting above the earth. The villagers go in procession to the spot, while one of the Madigas carries the rice, soaked in the blood of the lamb, in a basket. All the cattle of the village are then brought to the place and driven over the head of the unhappy pig, who is, of course, trampled to death; and as they pass over the pig the blood and rice are sprinkled upon them to preserve them from disease. Then, after this follows the final ceremony. The image of the goddess is taken from the canopy by the washerman, and a Madiga takes the head of the buffalo with its fore-leg in the mouth, the forehead and nostrils all smeared over with fat, and the earthen lamp still lighted on the top, and they all go in procession to the boundary of the village, first the man carrying the buffalo's head, then the washerman with the image, and then the small wooden cart. When the procession arrives at the extreme limit of the village lands they go on, for about a furlong, into the lands of the neighbouring village, and there the Asadis first chant the praises of the goddess, then some turmeric is distributed to all the people, and finally the image is divested of all its ornaments, and solemnly placed upon the ground and left there. The light on the head of the buffalo is extinguished and the head itself carried off by the Madiga, who takes it for a feast to his own house. The object of transporting the goddess to the lands of the next village is to transfer to that village the wrath of the deity, a precaution which does not

show much faith in the temper of the goddess, nor much charity towards their neighbours !

The sprinkling and application of the blood are in many villages an important and striking feature in these sacrifices. Sometimes the worshippers dip their fingers into it and apply it to their foreheads and breasts ; sometimes they dip cloths into it and hang it round their necks ; sometimes they sprinkle it on the doorposts or the big gates at the entrance of the villages. • The most common use is to mix it with boiled rice and sprinkle it round the boundaries of the village or through the streets, and in a few places the officiating priest even drinks the blood. In some villages the pariah pujari, after the head of the victim has been cut off, sucks the blood from the neck of the carcase, and during the night of the sacrifice will suck the blood of as many as a hundred sheep.

The sucking of the blood is a horrid business, but not so horrid as an annual ceremony which takes place every February or March at Trichinopoly, one of the great centres of trade and education in the Tamil country, during the festival of Kulumai-amman, who is regarded as the guardian against cholera and cattle plague and epidemics generally. A very fat pujari of the Vellala caste, who holds this unenviable office by hereditary right, is lifted up above the vast crowd on the arms of two men ; some two thousand kids are then sacrificed, one after the other. The blood of the first eight or ten is collected in a large silver vessel, holding about a quart, and handed up to the pujari, who drinks it all. Then, as the throat of each kid is cut, the animal is handed up to him and he sucks, or pretends to suck, the blood out of the carcase. The belief of the people is that the blood is consumed by the spirit of Kulumai-amman in the pujari ; and her image stands on a platform, during the ceremony, about fifteen yards away.

A similar idea is probably expressed by a particularly revolting method of killing sheep, which is not uncommon in Tamil villages during these festivals. One of the pujaris, who is sometimes painted to represent a leopard, flies at the sheep like a wild beast, seizes it by the throat with his teeth, and kills it by biting through the jugular vein. There is another strange ceremony, which is quite common in the Tamil country, connected with the propitiation of the boundary goddess, where the blood of the victim seems to be regarded as the food of malignant spirits. At Irungalur, a village about fourteen miles from Trichinopoly, it forms the conclusion of the festival to the local goddess Kurumbai. During the first seven days the image is duly washed, offerings of rice and fruit are made, and processions are held through the streets of the village. Then, on the eighth day, a small earthen pot, called the 'karagam,' is prepared at the shrine of the goddess. When it is ready, some boiled rice, fruits, cocoanuts and incense are first offered to it,

and then the pujari ties on his wrist a cord ('kapu') dyed with turmeric, to protect him from evil spirits. A lamb is next brought and sacrificed in front of him to give him supernatural power, and he then takes the pot on his head, marches with it in procession through the village to the sound of tom-toms and pipes, and finally deposits it under a booth erected in the middle of the village. On the eighth, ninth and tenth days the pot is taken in procession morning and evening, and rice and fruits, camphor and incense, are also offered to it.

On the tenth day, at about 7 a.m., before the procession starts, a lamb is killed in front of the pot. The throat is first cut, and then the head cut off and the blood collected in a new earthen pot filled with boiled rice. This pot is then put in a frame of ropes and taken by a pujari to a stone planted in the ground, about four feet high, called 'ellaikal' (*i.e.* boundary stone), some three hundred yards off. A crowd of villagers run after him with wild yells, but no tom-toms nor pipes are played. When he comes to the boundary stone, he runs round it thrice, and the third time throws the pot over his shoulder behind him on to another smaller stone, about two feet high and some five or six feet in circumference, which stands at the foot of the ellaikal. The earthen pot is dashed to pieces, the rice and blood fall on the two stones and all around them. The pujari then runs quickly back to the booth, where the 'karagam' stands, without looking behind him, followed by the crowd in dead silence. The man who carries the pot is supposed to be possessed by Karumbai, and is in a frantic state as he runs to the boundary stone and has to be held up by some of the crowd, who go with him, to prevent his falling to the ground. The pouring out of the rice and blood is regarded as a propitiation of an evil spirit residing in the boundary stone, called Ellai-Karuppai, and of all the evil and malignant spirits of the neighbourhood who are his attendants.

It is possible that the ceremony of burying a pig and driving the cattle over it is a relic of some form of human sacrifice, as there is a remarkable parallel to it in an ancient custom of the Lambadis, described by Mr. E. Thurston in his 'Ethnographical Notes in Southern India,' p. 507. 'In former times the Lambadis, before setting out on a journey, used to procure a little child, and bury it in the ground up to its shoulders, and then drive their loaded bullocks over the unfortunate victim. In proportion to the bullocks thoroughly trampling the child to death, so their belief in a successful journey increased.'

But as the pig was in Greece sacred to agricultural deities, *e.g.* Aphrodite, Adonis and Demeter, it is more probable that the custom indicates that the village deities of India were originally connected with agriculture.

There is a cruel custom prevailing in many parts of the Telugu country in connection with the worship of the village deities, which

in the interests of humanity might well be suppressed by Government without risk of a rebellion. At the end of the sacrifice a small cart is brought to the image with four, five, or nine pointed stakes standing upright at the corners and sides. Pigs, lambs, and fowls are then impaled alive upon the stakes, and the car is dragged in procession to the boundary of the village. The unhappy victims die in agonies on the way, and are taken off the stakes when the car reaches its destination. In the town of Ellore the impalement of animals was forbidden some forty years ago, and the people are quite content to tie the animals to the stakes without impaling them. The prohibition might safely be extended to the villages as well.

In many villages the fire-walking ceremony forms a curious feature in the festival of the village deity. At one shrine near Bangalore it takes place every year. A trench is dug in front of the shrine, about thirty feet long, five feet wide, and one-and-a-half feet deep, and washed with a solution of cow-dung to purify it. About thirty seers of boiled rice are then brought, on the fifth day of the festival, and offered to the goddess before the trench. It is all put into the trench and a large quantity of curds are poured over it, and then distributed to the people, who eat some on the spot and some at home. A cartload of firewood is then spread over the trench, set alight, and left to burn for about three hours, till the wood becomes a mass of red-hot embers. When all is ready, the people assemble, and the pujari, whose turn it is to conduct the worship, first bathes to purify himself, and then, amid the deafening din of trumpets, tom-toms and cymbals, and the clapping of hands, walks with bare feet slowly and deliberately over the glowing embers, the whole length of the trench, towards the shrine of the seven goddesses. After him about thirty or forty women walk over the red-hot embers with lighted lamps on their heads. Such is the power of the goddess, the people told me, that no one is injured. The pujari of the shrine declared positively that the people put no oil nor anything else on their feet when they walk over.

At Mysore city, where the fire-walking ceremony is also performed, I asked three men who had walked over the trench why they were not hurt; their reply was that people who were without sin were never hurt! I can only say that in this case their faces sadly belied their characters.

Origin of the Worship of Village Deities.—What the origin of the village deities and their worship may have been it is difficult to say. The system, as it now exists, combines many different ideas and customs, and probably resulted from the fusion of various forms of religion. In the Tamil country there are many features in the worship of the village deities which obviously have been adapted from Brahmanism, e.g. the elaborate washing of the images and the growing aversion to animal sacrifices. So in Mysore there are traces of sun worship in the cult of Bisal-Mari, and there are many features

in the system everywhere, which seem obviously to be borrowed from the worship, or rather the propitiation, of the spirits of the departed. But the system as a whole is redolent of the soil, and evidently belongs to a pastoral and agricultural community. The village is the centre round which it revolves, and the protection of the villagers the object for which it exists. At the same time it is quite possible that the ultimate origin of the religion may be traced further back to a nomadic stage of society. Very many of the rites and ceremonies have now entirely lost their meaning, and when the people are asked what a particular ceremony means, or what its object is, their usual reply is simply 'It is mamool,' *i.e.* custom, and there are many details of the sacrifices which seem strangely inconsistent with the general idea and theory of the worship which now prevails. The one object of all the worship and sacrifices now is to propitiate various spirits, good and evil. And this is done by means of gifts which, it is supposed, the spirits like, or by ceremonies which will please them. Some of the spirits are supposed to delight in bloodshed, so animals are killed in their presence, and sometimes even the blood is given them to drink, or blood and rice are sprinkled over the fields and streets or thrown up in the air for them to eat. To the less refined goddesses or to the coarser male attendants, arrack, toddy and cheroots are freely offered, because it is assumed that these gifts will rejoice their hearts and propitiate them. But a great deal of the ritual and many of the most striking ceremonies are quite inconsistent with this gift theory and the idea of propitiation, which is now assumed to be the one motive and purpose of the festivals. For instance, one of the main features of the animal sacrifices is the various applications of the blood of the victims; sometimes the blood is applied to the bodies of the worshippers themselves, to their foreheads and breasts; sometimes it is sprinkled on the lintels and doorposts of the shrines, sometimes on the houses or cattle, sometimes on the boundary stones; sometimes it is mixed with rice and scattered over the streets, or sprinkled all round the boundaries of the village lands. But what possible meaning could these various uses of the blood have according to the gift theory of sacrifice? On this theory it would be intelligible why it should be drunk, as is sometimes done, by the pujari, who represents the goddess; but of these other uses of the blood the gift theory seems to furnish no adequate explanation. Or again, what possible meaning could the gift theory suggest for the widespread custom of putting the entrails round the neck of the pujari and the liver in his mouth? It is not probable that such a custom as this originated without there being some reason or idea at the back of it, but on the gift theory it seems absolutely meaningless.

Or again, another leading feature of the worship is the sacrificial feast, in various forms. Sometimes the feast takes place on the

spot, in the compound of the shrine ; more often the carcase is taken home by the offerer for a feast in his own house ; sometimes it is a formal and ceremonious act, as in certain villages of the Telugu country, where five little boys are fed with the flesh of the victim under cover of a large cloth, to keep off evil spirits or the evil eye. Here again the gift theory seems quite inconsistent with the whole idea of the sacrificial feast. The explanation often given, that the goddess consumes the essence or spirit of the gifts, while the worshippers take the material substance, is probably quite modern, and is certainly far too subtle to have occurred to the mind of the primitive villager. I suspect that it has really been borrowed from the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, as I have chiefly met with it in districts where the Roman Catholic Church has been for some time strong and influential ; but in any case it can hardly be regarded as the original idea which explains the sacrificial feast. On the other hand, all these ceremonies, which form some of the leading features of the whole system, find a natural and ready explanation if we assume that the system originated in the desire for communion with the deity worshipped, and not in the idea of propitiation, and that the victim was originally not a gift to the deity, but represented the deity itself.

On this assumption the various modes of sprinkling and applying the blood, which is the life, and the sacrificial feast were all originally intended to promote communion with the spirit that was worshipped. In the same way, even such a ceremony as the wearing of the entrails round the neck and putting the liver in the mouth acquires an intelligible meaning and purpose. The liver and entrails are naturally connected with the life of the animal, and the motive of this repulsive ceremony would seem to be an intense desire to obtain as close communion as possible with the object of worship by wearing those parts of its body that are especially connected with its life. So, too, this theory explains why the animal sacrificed is so often treated as an object of worship. In the case of the buffalo sacrifices in the Telugu country, as we have seen, the buffalo is paraded through the village, decked with turmeric and kunkuma, and then, as it passes by the houses, people come out and pour water on its feet and worship it. But why should this be done if the animal sacrificed is regarded only as a gift to the goddess ? When, however, we realise that the animal sacrificed was not originally regarded as a gift, but as the representative of the spirit to be worshipped, the whole ceremony becomes full of meaning.

It is possible that the connection between the growth of agriculture and the origin of village communities may account for the fact that the village deities of South India are almost always females. Agriculture naturally begins as the occupation of women rather than of men. The business of man in the tribe was to hunt and fight ; but

the cultivation of the fields, when it first began on a small scale, would almost certainly be regarded as part of the household duties of the women, and beneath the dignity of their lords and masters. Indeed, it is a well-known fact that at the present day among savage races agriculture is left to the women. Hence it would be only natural that the agricultural deities, connected with the cultivation of the soil, and probably at first exclusively worshipped by women, should be female rather than male. •

These theories as to the origin of the village deities and of animal sacrifice in South India can, of course, only be regarded as hypotheses. But there can be no doubt that the ceremonial observed in these sacrifices gives very substantial support to the theory that the original idea of sacrifice was not that of a gift to the deity, but communion with a supernatural power. And if that is true, then we may see, even in these primitive rites, a foreshadowing of far higher forms of religious belief and practice. The mysterious efficacy attributed to the sprinkling of the blood might almost be regarded as an unconscious prophecy of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement, while the whole ritual of the sacrifices, even in its crudest and most revolting forms, bears witness to that instinctive craving after communion with God which finds its highest expression and satisfaction in the sacramental system of the Christian Church.

HENRY MADRAS.

PAN-ISLAMISM

Is Pan-Islamism a scarecrow invented for political purposes, or is it a real danger to our civilising efforts in Mohammedan Asia, and particularly to England as the Power which rules over the largest number of Mohammedan subjects in the world? This question, which has been brought to the fore by the Denshawī affair, has very naturally elicited a keen interest in political circles, and in order to fully appreciate its importance we must get to the bottom of the conception itself and examine what can be understood by it. If Pan-Islamism denotes a religious community, in strong opposition against unbelievers, animated by a proselytising zeal and declaring war on all those who are intent upon its political destruction, then we must look upon it as an old—nay, very old—association, sanctioned by the prophet himself, who has put it as a fundamental principle that *all true believers are brethren*, and in support of which he has ordered the *Haj*—i.e. holy pilgrimage, an annual meeting of true believers in Mecca and Medina, as one of the four main commands of Islam. Now, as long as the religion of the Arabian prophet was victorious in three parts of the world, the idea of Pan-Islamism was very little or seldom spoken of; nay, the spirit of the brotherhood was so lax that the different parts of that once mighty community hardly noticed the stress and danger which threatened their co-religionist parties and never thought of lending assistance to them. The Omeyyads in Spain were vanquished at a time when the Khalifs of Bagdad were still in full power and vigour. Bagdad fell under the strokes of Helagu Khan when Islam in Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt was strong enough, and Kazan as well as Astrakhan was conquered by Russia when the Ottomans were at the zenith of their power. The defence of mutual interests was never thought of. The Sultans of Turkey announced in bombastic letters their victories over Christianity to their co-religionists in Middle and Far Asia; but, excepting Sultan Soliman's desire to conquer India from the Portuguese, no plan for a common action against the rising power of the West is traceable. It is true the Sultans of Turkey, such as Soliman and Murad IV., tried to further their interests by fostering a common feeling of Pan-Islamism in the outlying districts of Asia, but their sundry experiments had no effect,

owing partly to the deficient political understanding of the respective leaders, partly also to the unshaken feeling of security those minor components of Islam enjoyed at those times. In looking somewhat deeper into the matter, we shall find that Pan-Islamism came forward in proportion as the political independence of the Mohammedan countries was threatened or annihilated by the growing superiority of the West and the accelerated communication of modern times. It was only at the beginning of the last century that the existence of a common danger began to be seriously recognised, and that means and measures were devised to ward off the danger. I have before me an Arabic pamphlet entitled *General Advice to the Kings and Peoples of Islam*, by a learned theologian of the High School of Mecca, named Ahmad, al Barzinji-al-Husaini, which dates from the fifties of the past century, and in which attention is drawn to the steadily increasing power of the Christian world, to the crying wrongs and cruelties committed by us against Islam, and in which the successful emulation with our scientific and economical efforts is declared to be the only secure way of escape from total destruction. Somewhat later on similar signs of an awakening were noticeable in Turkey during the reign of Sultan Abdul Medjid, when the younger Turkish generation betook itself to study the bygone period of Arabic cultural splendour, emphasising at the same time the necessity of arousing a common Moslem feeling along the entire length and breadth of Islam. It was the late Aali Pasha who headed the movement. Travellers from the distant East were honoured and taken care of, and as there existed long time ago in Constantinople a *Bokhara-Tekkesi* and a *Hind-Tekkesi*, a kind of a convent or hospice for Mohammedans coming from Central Asia and India, a more intense sympathy was felt for these foreign guests and a closer connection with the distant East was tried. It was under the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid, whose restless and active mind was always fond of machinations, that the Pan-Islamic movement found a most energetic support. Messengers under the guise of religious preachers and expounders of the Koran were sent to all quarters of the globe proclaiming the pious feelings of the Khalifa, and exhorting the true believers to persevere in their faith and to unite in a common bond in the defence of Islam. These seemingly unofficial missions were from time to time answered by delegations sent from Bokhara and Afghanistan, as well as by learned Mohammedans from India; but it would be idle to attribute to this exchange of mission some far-going political importance, for the predominant feature was of a religious character.

As time went on, and when the rays of modern culture began to have an earlier and easier access to the interior of Asia, and when the European methods and spirit of association began to spread, we notice in India and in Egypt the awakening of Pan-Islamism. As to India, we have to read the late Sir W. W. Hunter's *Our Indian Mussulmans* to get an idea of what was going on with regard to

Pan-Islamism under the shelter of British toleration and, let me say at once, shortsightedness. In Egypt things stood differently. Since the accession of Mehemmed Ali to power, and particularly since his protracted quarrel with his sovereign power on the Bosphorus, French influence was gradually increasing on the Nile. The Egyptian always liked to boast and to parade with the pretension of being more civilised, more refined, and more Europeanised than the Turk, and a breeze recalling the boulevards of Paris blew in fact in certain social circles of Cairo and Alexandria. It was owing to the temporary Gallicisation of Egypt, which consisted of a very thin layer of Western culture, that political extravagances began to take hold of the Egyptians, and at the outset the craving for independence from the rule of the Sultan increased from day to day. Egyptians took the lead in modern liberalism amongst Mohammedans, and an Egyptian prince—namely, Mustafa Fazil Pasha—gathered around him the young discontented Osmanli students in Europe, and laid the foundation of the political party called ‘Young Turkey.’ That Egypt herself derived very little or no benefit from this show of modern culture need hardly be said. The material condition of the country deteriorated from day to day, the poor fellah was trodden down, robbed, and plundered; of justice and order there was no trace, and the Egyptian army was in such a pitiable condition that the contingent sent by the Khedive during the last Russo-Turkish war in support of his sovereign, to Varna, was well admired for their choice uniform and arms, but from a military point of view the auxiliary army was *nil* and useless. It was related that in the bodyguard of the Viceroy each private had a golden watch in his pocket, but no military virtues in his breast. Suffice to say that the continual squandering and reckless dissipation of the resources of the country had brought Egypt to the brink of bankruptcy; the revolt of Arabi Pasha was an ill-disguised plan to get rid of the European creditors; England had to step in to save the threatened investments of the creditors; and, though the occupation of Egypt closed a sad period of Egyptian anarchy, despotism, and misrule, it opened the door to European rivalry and diplomatic interference, which, although partly discarded by the happy event of the *entente cordiale*, is, nevertheless, still eagerly used in favour of the ambitious and grasping policy of a well-known European Power.

If the twenty-four years of British rule over Egypt had not been so rich in all kind of blessings, and if the progress visible in all stages of public life had not made such extraordinary and astounding strides, enemies and ill-wishers might well have a plea to justify this emulation; but since enemies and friends are all unanimous in acknowledging that the English occupation has done immense good to the country, and has raised the formerly downtrodden fellah to a degree of prosperity and freedom he never dreamt of under the rule of his co-religionist princes, the abovementioned interference cannot

be too strongly condemned, and must be styled an act of wanton cruelty to mankind, and a sacrilegious attack against the cause of civilisation and humanity. Without entering into details about the perpetrators of this crime, stress must be laid upon the afflicting fact that, through the jealousy and ill-will of the interfering Power, the discontented Egyptians have found, and are steadily finding, great encouragement in their revolutionary schemes, and, very far from the idea of substituting another foreign ruler for the present one, they come out publicly with the motto 'Egypt for the Egyptians,' doing all in their power to blacken the name of the Christian benefactor of the country, and to decry England as a ruthless tyrant and oppressor. It is certainly wonderful how truth can be so horribly distorted and bright facts so utterly disfigured; but politics are an ugly game, said Goethe; gratitude does not belong to the conspicuous qualities of nations, and so we see to-day, if not the whole of Egypt, a considerable number of the so-called enlightened, but really semi-civilised, Egyptians turning against that very Power which has raised them from the dust of ignominy, poverty, and tyranny, and made them rich as they never were before.

It is in face of this unparalleled monstrosity that we must ask ourselves, What is the secret spring of the whole movement? Is it the aforesaid foreign influence, is it the patriotic desire for political independence, or is it the hidden fire of Pan-Islamism which agitates the religious minds, trying to reinstate the faith of the Arabian prophet in its former political independence, and to begin a war against the supremacy of the Christian West? I think, as far as regards Egypt, all three agencies are simultaneously at work; but, considering the title by which this paper is headed, we have to devote a particular attention to Pan-Islamism, and to examine its possibilities and its present and future danger to our civilising efforts in the Moslem world. We have to put before all other questions whether we can understand by this word a unanimous and united action of all Mohammedans in the three parts of the world, and whether such an action can and will prove disastrous to the advancing power of the West. As to the former, it is obviously clear that a religious community, stretching over such a vast area and living under such widely different climatic, ethnical, and ethical conditions as Islam, cannot so easily be united into common action, for which a certain degree of culture and political maturity is indispensable. In letting pass before my eyes the sturdy and plain Ozbeg the Turkoman, together with the sly and cunning Tadjik and Sart of Central Asia; in holding review over the Moulvi of India, the Beduin and the Wahabi of Nejd, the vainglorious Akhond of Persia, the self-conceited Arab of Syria; the honest, much-advanced, and hard-working Tartar of South Russia; the plain and brave Osmanli of Anatolia, and over many other members of the Moslem community, I cannot help noticing the wide gulf which separates one from the other—a gulf

which cannot be so easily bridged by the *Kalima* (profession of faith), and by other uniting forces of Islam. From a theoretical point of view it is quite admissible to speak of a sacred brotherhood and of a secret Hermandad, as it pleases the fanatics, but in reality it would be idle to suppose that the large unwieldy body extending from the interior of China to the Atlantic, and from Tobolsk to Java and to the interior of Africa, can be so easily brought into motion and utilised for the purpose of a Pan-Islamic action. No, that is impossible; for, admitting that we can speak of a Pan-Christian movement during the Crusades, Islam has never furnished a similar example—nay, on the contrary, we have often witnessed many intestine wars amongst the various components of the Mohammedan community, which accelerated and led to the political downfall of the whole body. Anybody trying, therefore, to rank the Pan-Islamic movement amongst the threatening dangers of the day is certainly mistaken; for, besides the quoted arguments, we ought not to forget that nearly two-thirds of the Mohammedans are under Christian rule, and consequently lacking the free hand necessary for a deliberate and successful action. The rumours current about the uncounted millions in the Dark Continent, in China, and in Arabia, deserve as much credit as the haphazard numbers of the Mohammedans of Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan, where up to the present no census has been taken, and where all numerical dates rest upon guesswork.

Nobody will and can pretend that the followers of the religion of the Arabian prophet, who occupy to-day the same position which Christianity occupied in the twelfth and thirteenth century, are particularly well disposed against Christendom, whose spiritual and material ascendancy they have to feel everywhere. It would be self-delusion to assume their acquiescence in the fate they have to endure. But, instead of speaking of a general rising of Pan-Islamism, we have before us at present only *local outbursts of those Mohammedan countries* where the Moslem population exceeds the number of non-Moslems, and where a certain progress on the path of Western culture has awakened the premature desire for political independence, as shown in the case of Egypt. 'Young Egypt' will of course demur to our using the adjective of *premature*, but serious questions cannot be handled with obliging delicacy and without offending the *amour-propre* of Mustafa Kamel Pasha, the actual leader of the anti-English movement on the Nile, whose personal visit I had several times in Budapest. I would beg leave to ask him: whether he is quite sure that, on the withdrawing of England from Egypt, the country will continue in the flourishing condition of to-day; whether the Egyptian trade, which has risen in ten years from 23,271,000*l.* to 41,924,000*l.*, will go on increasing; whether the fellah will augment the freedom, security, and well-being he enjoys under the much hated and despised Christian foreigner? It is true he and many other excited patriots say: 'We prefer poverty and tyranny under native Mohammedan princes to

wealth and liberty under a foreign ruler.' But I very much doubt whether this opinion is shared by his less fanatic countrymen of riper consideration. The anti-English papers, such as *Al Liwa* (The Standard) and *Al Moayad* (The Helper), may continue to be sold and read in nine to ten thousand copies, but this does not prove that the English evacuation of Egypt will be a blessing to the country. *Qui bene distinguit bene docet*, says a Latin proverb. Modern Egypt has undoubtedly made remarkable strides in Western culture, as there are many Egyptians who excel in sundry branches of modern sciences—thanks to the peace and order enjoyed under British rule—but, taken as a whole, the general cultural, social, and moral situation of the country has not yet attained the degree of education necessary for self-government. The false splendour and the tawdry dress or outward show are appearing in many features of the life of the so-called modern Egypt, and it reminds me much of the rising Osmanli generation in the middle of the last century, with whom a smattering of French and the adoption of patent leather boots and glacé gloves denoted the progressive Turk. I am the last to wish to blacken the leaders of Mohammedan society, but I beg leave to ask: does there exist a Mohammedan Government where the deep-seated evil of tyranny, anarchy, misrule, and utter collapse does not offer the most appalling picture of human caducity? It is a very dubious service these fiery 'patriots' render to their country by throwing obstacles in England's way; they do more harm than good, for a well-informed French writer in *Le Temps* is quite right in saying: 'Et l'Angleterre prendra pour prétexte l'opposition maladroite que lui font et que vont continuer à lui faire des "patriotes" à courte vue'—namely, by changing the protectorate into annexation.

Next to these inconsiderate patriots of Egypt a good portion of reproof should fall on her so-called foreign friends, who, moved by envy and jealousy, are steadily inciting the Egyptians against their present teacher and benefactor, forgetting altogether that by injuring and retarding the work of *one* Western Power the others must also feel the nefarious consequences. To these dubious well-wishers belonged formerly France, Russia, and in fact all rivals of the British in the East, and in the foremost rank those adventurers and fortune-seekers for whom the newly introduced order has barred the way to adventurous concerns. To ingratiate themselves with the Egyptians all kind of slander was invented, all possible opprobrium was thrown on the English. Amongst the latter ones, I am sorry to say, we find even an Englishman, who, anxious to foster the pure Egyptian patriotism, has composed *La Marscillaise Egyptienne! Chanson Patriotique Egyptienne*, and dedicated it to his Highness Abbas Pasha the Second. From the first strophe:

—' Un Pays (se disant—non barbare !)
De l'Egypte se voudrait s'emparer !

Si, rusóment, il s'en empare,
 L'Europe il voudrait chicaner !
 Notre brave Khédive—de dignes manières —
 Devait régner *sans gouverner* !
 On le tiendrait en lisières !
 Pour, ainsi, mieux l'intimider.
 Vive la Liberté !
 L'Egypte émancipée
 (Louanges à Dieu !)
 Que l'Anglais s'en esquive !
 De l'Egypte Khédive !
 (Louanges à Dieu !)
 Que l'Anglais s'en esquive !

The reader may gauge the whole contents of the insipid poetry which was published in 1893 in London, and circulated amongst the patriots on the Nile. Other similar literary compositions have appeared and been approved of in and out of Egypt, and we may well ask, Is it to be wondered that an Eastern people, unaccustomed to the firm law and order of a stable government, should be ready to turn against the new state of things created by the English occupation, and that the number of discontented and disappointed should steadily increase ? Unfortunately for England's position in Egypt, certain Mohammedan circles some time ago began to look upon Germany's policy in the Mohammedan world as openly antagonistic to Great Britain and obviously sympathetic to Islam. The Kaiser's intimate friendship with Sultan Abdul Hamid, his speech in Damascus at the time of his visit to Palestine, when he called the Khalifa the lord supreme of three hundred millions of Mohammedans—his appearance and behaviour at Tangiers, and many other ostentatious demonstrations of friendship to Islam have unavoidably flattered and raised the hopes of a certain class in the Moslem world. It is no secret that this relation of Germany to the Mohammedans is beginning also to be valued in the eyes of the Germans themselves, and only a short time ago we read in a German weekly, published in London, in an article from the able pen of Mr. Carl Peters, the well-known African traveller, tracing the actually not very brilliant political constellation of the Fatherland, the following passage :—

'Einen einzigen Faktor gibt es, der für uns in die Waagschale mitfallen könnte und im Fall eines Weltkrieges nutzbar für uns gemacht werden kann : das ist der Islam. Als Pan-Islamismus liess er sich gegen Grossbritannien, wie gegen die französische Republik ausspielen und, wenn die deutsche Politik kühn genug ist, kann es das Dynamit bilden, welches die Herrschaft der Westmächte von Cap Nun bis nach Kalkutta in die Luft sprengt.' ¹

¹ 'There is one factor which might fall on our side of the balance and in the case of a World-war might be made useful to us : that factor is, Islam. As Pan-Islamism it could be played against Great Britain as well as against the French Republic ; and if German policy is bold enough, it can fashion the dynamite to blow into the air the rule of the Western Powers from Cape Nun to Calcutta.'

This is, at all events, a most amiable intention, although I greatly doubt whether a high-minded and ingenious prince like William the Second will ever associate himself with such a destructive and barbarous scheme; but the fact in itself that such a scheme could be devised and expounded is a telling and ominous proof of the exasperation and irritation which the political relations between Germany and the Western Powers have reached. And this fact must be highly regretted. I belong to those who always advocated an amicable understanding between England and Germany, as shown by a paper published in this Review (March, 1903). I go even further, and say that the apparition of Germany in Asia Minor will be most advantageous to our civilising efforts in the East; for the industrious, learned, and painstaking Germans will leave a salutary influence upon the social, economic, and cultural development of the motley population of Anatolia. But this could all be done without the application of visionary plans and without the adoption of forcible means, which, whilst seriously injuring the purposes of our civilising efforts, will be of no good to Germany herself. If German politicians imagine that by constantly petting the absolutist and ruinous rule of Sultan Abdul Hamid, and by striving to represent the Emperor William the Second as the protector of Islam, they will attain their end, they are sadly mistaken. Before all, I beg to allude to the fact that the policy of Yildiz is not the policy of Turkey; for although the mute and dumb public opinion in Turkey, where the most cruel censorship has strangled the Press, has not shown up to the present its absolute dislike and reluctance to the Germanophile policy of the court, the free Turkish papers published outside of Turkey are and have been always prone to abuse and to discredit the policy of the Sultan, whom they blame for the very flimsy equivalent he has got up to the present for many valuable concessions given to Germany in military matters, in mining and shipping concerns, in railways, and in all kinds of commercial and industrial enterprises. And, further, who in the world will be so naïve as to believe that a Christian ruler will so easily ingratiate himself with the orthodox Mohammedan people; with a society whose religious life and notions are such as ours were in the eleventh and twelfth centuries? As the Kaiser is not averse to be compared with great historical figures, we beg leave to quote the case of General Bonaparte, of whom it is well known that, in trying to win the sympathies of the influential Arab sheikhs of Cairo, he publicly avowed his admiration and affection for the religion of the Prophet. Well, what was the result of this simulated apostasy? Bonaparte says in excuse (I quote the learned Orientalist, Victor Chauvin, in his treatise²):—

‘Je réussissais en Egypte parce que je me montrais musulman avec les sectateurs du prophète—En les cajolant j’ai été prévenu par eux de trois combats contre moi.’

A native historian, however (Nakoula), has a different opinion, and he says :—

‘ Il (Bonaparte) traitait les Musulmans avec bonté, leur témoignait une grande amitié, paraissait plein de respect pour la religion musulmane, et prétendait qu’il suivait l’évidente vérité, ainsi qu’eux-mêmes. Mais les Egyptiens n’ajoutaient pas foi à ses discours, ils les regardaient comme une déception et n’avaient pas de tranquillité.’

One may well assume that where the acknowledged Corsican juggler did not succeed, success will hardly be attained by the German Emperor. It is a great pity that the German Emperor is not duly informed of the disaffection and hatred he has created amongst the enlightened Turks by the support he gives to Sultan Abdul Hamid, for the general opinion prevails in Turkey that it is the Kaiser who instigates the Sultan to continue his absolutist rule, and who dissuades him from according liberties to his people. Not more creditable is the Emperor’s interference in Morocco, where he tries to uphold the rule of one of the most dissolute, incapable, and despotic princes, who depends on the activity of robber chiefs like Raisuli and Anflus, and whose government is the very prototype of the mediæval corsair states on the north-west of Africa. How can this policy be united with the civilising Christian spirit of the Emperor in whom we are accustomed to see not only a soldier, a sailor, a musician and statesman, but also a preacher of sermons and a defender of the faith of Christ? The support and encouragement given to Pan-Islamism is certainly not the happy instrument which will secure to Germany a future ascendancy over France and England in Mohammedan Asia, and it requires a good deal of casuistry to justify the position assumed by William the Second at the head of Pan-Islamism against Christianity.

We repeat therefore, if Pan-Islamism—viz. a united action of all Mohammedans in the world—is under the present circumstances impossible, a local outburst of political efforts, under the disguise of religious fanaticism, deserves the much more our full attention, and the danger of such an attempt threatens in the first place Great Britain’s imperial interests, partly in Egypt, partly also in India, where modern views about liberty and self-government have sooner found entrance than in the rest of the Moslem world, and where, so to speak, the foreign conqueror, through his educational system, has himself forged and sharpened the weapon by which he is threatened. This is a dilemma which could hardly be avoided, and it is incumbent upon England to be prepared for all emergencies and to look straight in the face of coming events. It must be borne in mind that the present unrest in certain portions of the Mohammedan world must be eminently ascribed to the increased facilities in the field of public instruction, to the closer acquaintance with modern sciences and literature, and to the remarkable approach of a certain class of Mohammedans to our Western views and mode of thinking. The progress with regard

to this revival is simply astounding. Modern schools are everywhere opened; even the Khan of Khiva has recently founded a college; newspapers come out like mushrooms, journeys to Europe have become fashionable, and, as this cultural movement steadily goes on, the actual European tutor and civiliser will certainly have to reckon with the future accomplishments of his pupil, and will have to bear the consequences. This necessity will press upon us whether we like it or not. But as this is an event of an incalculable time to come, we have to concentrate all our care and attention upon the task and the time actually before us, and, far from being afraid of the momentary restlessness of our pupil under instruction, we have to adopt precautionary measures against all juvenile leaps and bounds, and beyond all we must not tolerate freaks by which our civilising efforts may be retarded or rendered futile. This caution refers particularly to England's position in Egypt, where, as previously emphasised, the ground has long ago been prepared for unripe liberal pretensions, and where a very thin layer of Western culture has produced a self-conceitedness and has roused ill-founded aspirations. Of course it is very difficult for England to act against the very spirit of liberty and toleration which has been always the pride and ornament of British administration all over the world; but in a country where the Christian element and the ruling power is faced by such an immense majority, exceptional measures are not only permitted—nay, they have become an imperious necessity, and temporary restriction of the Press, for example, is certainly less injurious to the welfare of England and Egypt than the political hallucinations of a certain class of journalists who, by envenoming public opinion, do great harm to the moral and material interests of their country.

It is a pity that English statesmen and politicians do not pay sufficient attention to the emanations of the Mohammedan press, which has become of late a most important factor in our political relations with Moslem Asia. Most of these papers, edited by men conversant with one or several European languages, and provided with sufficient historical and geographical knowledge to form a proper conception of the leading topics, have a particularly sharp eye on daily occurrences which refer to the common cause of Islam, to the grievances of any section of the Moslem world, be it even far away from them, and it is really astonishing that hardly any act touching the schemes and deeds of our government in Asia escapes their attention. I shall quote but one example. Whereas *The Times* has taken up, only a few days ago, the discussion of the origin and meaning of *Bande Mataram*, the revolutionary appeal of Bengal, I have found, four months ago, Turkish, Tartar, and Arab papers explaining the significance and importance of this war cry to their readers, rejoicing at the same time at the grave troubles awaiting the British administration of India in connection with the partition of Bengal. Any open attack directed against England, or any fiery appeal in the interest

of unity and encouragement to shake off the hated yoke of the Christian conqueror is quoted and carefully translated in the newspapers of the different countries.* There appeared, a few months ago, in the Arab paper *Ez Zahir*, a kind of proclamation to Indians and Egyptians to rise against England, of which I beg leave to give a concise extract :

It is almost certain that when a great power endeavours to raise the mental condition of the subjugated smaller power, it usually happens that the weaving loom, from which the conqueror has fetched his means and resources, will in the ultimate end produce also the deathpall of his grandeur. We notice this in the relation of Rome with the less civilised nations, we see it in the history of France, and this will also undoubtedly be the case of Great Britain in her relation with the conquered elements. In accordance with our proverb—'Collapse is the next-door neighbour to greatness'—we see that England, which for the sake of aggrandisement has extended her conquests over the whole world and adopted the name of Lord of the Seas, is nevertheless quickly approaching the days of her downfall. The nations living under her oppression and tyranny begin to see the dawn of liberty, and the foremost of the latter ones is the people of India. This unfortunate people has for a hundred and fifty years been groaning under the cruel yoke of despotism, and it is only by laying heavy fetters on the hands and feet of her victims that England maintains her overpowering position. When these miserable slaves stretch out their tongue to lick at something, the English at once raise their heavy hand, preventing them from eating and drinking. It is thus that the English suck the blood of millions of Indians, and when a few years ago the cholera broke out, ravaging the country frightfully, the English, instead of using preventive measures, did nothing to stop the evil. India has become a place of pleasure-trips and sport for the Britisher. The Indian chiefs give valuable presents to the visitor, who returns richly laden to his country, parading at the same time the honesty, integrity, and incorruptibility of his nation. And then was it not the English Government which appointed Warren Hastings, a most ignorant, corrupt, and tyrannical fellow, as ruler over the whole of India? It was only after numberless complaints of crying injustices had reached the Central Government that he was dismissed from office. Well, such is the manner of acting of the famous just, civilised, and moderate English! Happily their policy of infinite treachery and ruse is beginning to burst, and the time of revenge against these insolent, overbearing, and haughty oppressors has arrived at last. The elongated shadow of the afternoon sun of their power will soon disappear! When His Majesty the King of England, in a speech from the throne, said: 'We shall accord liberty and independence to the people of the Transvaal in order to facilitate their progress and to secure their attachment to the Crown,' the people of India may well ask 'Why are similar concessions not accorded to India, or are the Indians less capable and less gifted than the South Africans?' And, further, if the English avail themselves of such pretexts, who is the cause of our having remained behind—we, the quiet and obedient people, or the so-called disinterested magnanimous teacher? It is all useless to misrepresent facts, for it is patent that there is no difference between India of to-day and between India of the middle ages, and all high-sounding statements about our great strides in civilisation is but grandiloquent empty talk. Nobody can deny that the Indians were formerly the great owners of Central Asia; their culture was predominant, and some of their towns became the centre of learning and knowledge, from which it had spread to the most distant parts of the world. Until quite recently nobody knew hardly anything about Japan; but unity coupled with the firm and resolute intention of a handful of men has produced extraordinary results and vanquished the once much-dreaded power of the North. Afraid of this wonderful success, proud and

haughty Albion had to condescend and to seek the friendship and alliance of Japan, which occupies to-day a foremost rank amongst the great nations of the world, whereas India, having passed one hundred and fifty years under foreign rule, is still in need of instruction and education. This is what we know as the result of British rule in India. Are we not entitled to ask what will become of Egypt under the rule of the same Power; of Egypt, known as the Beauty of the East, the trade centre of the world, and the Lord of the Seas; of Egypt, whose export has lately risen to a height never attained by India? We consequently ask: has the time not come yet when, uniting the suppressed wailings of India with our own groans and sighs in Egypt, we should say to each other, 'Come, let us be one, following the divine words, Victory belongs to the united forces'? Or should we Egyptians, in taking a lesson from the people of the Transvaal in their desire for self government, not give vent to similar desires? Certainly the time has come when we (India and Egypt) should cut and tear asunder the ties of the yoke imposed on us by the English.

Papers of similar amiable contents are published under the eyes of the British administration of Egypt and the question is well justified: Is this the outcome of toleration and liberty. or of negligence and carelessness? I am afraid this is too much of what is called indulgence and forbearance, and if a change does not set in very shortly the dire results will be felt along the whole line and the consequences will be disastrous to the British rule in Moslem Asia. The incident of Denshawī must be looked upon at all events as a timely warning against an excessive feeling of security. That British officers could not find another pastime than the shooting of doves amidst a population where these birds are particularly petted, must be highly regretted, for we have no right to disregard the manners and habits of a foreign country, however silly and childish they may seem to us. The mischief was naturally on both sides, but the Government could not stop the course of justice, and due punishment had to be meted out to the act of murder in cold blood, for indulgence would have been dangerous with a constantly incited and revolutionised population. Humanity-mongers may be shocked and incensed at the use of gallows and kurbash, but they may rest assured that these somewhat mediæval appliances are certainly less horrible and shocking than the evil produced by an out-of-place leniency at a time when sedition is nearly ripe, and when a community, being on the best way to secure the blessings of a better future, is stubbornly bent upon falling back into the dark night of anarchy, despotism, and barbarity.

In conclusion, I must forestall any criticism eventually arising out of the apparent incongruity between the views expressed in this paper and my position as a friend of Islam. It is because I am a well-wisher of the Mohammedans and anxiously desirous to see their lot ameliorated that I must declare myself against all adventurous and ill-devised plans of forcible revolution, such as the confidence in Pan-Islamism, which must long remain an empty vision, and, by rousing the suspicion of the mighty European Powers, will curtail the liberties the Moslems enjoy at present and will uselessly retard the work of their progress.

A. VAMBERY.

*FROM A DIARY AT DUBLIN CASTLE
DURING THE PHŒNIX PARK TRIAL*

Chief Secretary's Lodge,
Phoenix Park, Dublin.

Saturday, January 27, 1883.—We have arrived here on a short visit to Mr. and Mrs. Trevelyan, and we shall be staying at Dublin Castle during the early part of the trial of the men who murdered Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke in the Phoenix Park on the 6th of May last year. Mr. Trevelyan,¹ who now fills the post to which Lord Frederick was appointed, has to be guarded even in his own grounds. We saw this at once, for although he had kindly sent his own carriage to meet us at the station we noticed soldiers with rifles who challenged us at the entrance gate, and at the door of the house there stood a group of policemen and detectives, who looked closely at us.

Sunday, January 28.—On looking out early this morning I saw two soldiers pacing about the lawn. A policeman marched up and down the gravel walk before the windows, and two of the mounted police-patrol were riding near the sunk fence. We walked about the grounds with Mr. and Mrs. Trevelyan, followed by three detectives, and policemen seemed to be everywhere. These grounds are particularly well laid out, with fine trees, and the gardens are good, with plenty of glass. Part only of the expense of keeping them up is paid by Government, the rest has to come out of the Chief Secretary's own pocket. Inside the Lodge only the absolutely necessary furniture is provided; the Chief Secretary has to find his own linen and china, cutlery and glass, as well as everything ornamental, and most of what is necessary for comfort. His salary is 4,000*l.* a year, with 400*l.* extra for fuel. Mr. Trevelyan's work is very trying, and he has not had a single day's holiday since he arrived here three days after the Phoenix Park murders. Going over to England for the House of Commons is no holiday to him.

Monday, January 29.—After luncheon C.² and Mr. Trevelyan walked through the Phoenix Park towards Dublin, attended by

¹ Afterwards Sir George Trevelyan, Bart.

² Charles Savile Roundell, M.P., husband of the writer of these extracts.—Ed.

detectives who kept only a pace behind them. A little later Mrs. Trevelyan and I followed them in an open carriage, and I confess that I soon wished it had been closed. We were accompanied by an Irish car, on which sat two detectives. Mr. Trevelyan is never allowed to walk in Dublin, for the greatest danger is in the streets. We passed the scene of the murders—a raised footpath beside the broad road, just in front of the Vice-Regal Lodge. The grass near is all destroyed, and even the ground itself is worn away, by the feet of the crowds which have visited the spot. The view was lovely; the blue mountains of Wicklow seemed to be floating in light, but my thoughts turned not only to what had so recently happened on that road, but to what might happen again at any moment now. The Park seemed to be studded with mounted police, they were riding in pairs along the roads and across the grass in every direction. We picked up C. and Mr. Trevelyan, their detectives joining ours on the car. I sat backwards beside Mr. Trevelyan; he held his revolver in his hand under the carriage-rug, and each of the detectives on the car behind us carried a revolver in a convenient pocket, partially concealed by a handkerchief. The streets along the Quays in Dublin are squalid in the extreme, and savage-looking men lounged at every corner. They scowled at us as we drove along, and every time we passed one of these groups of men I felt Mr. Trevelyan's arm stiffen as he grasped his revolver. He and his attendants were set down at Dublin Castle, and we went on with ours to the National Gallery of Ireland. Many of the best pictures are now being exhibited in London, but had the walls been covered with the masterpieces of the world I could not have enjoyed them, trembling with fright as I was. Mrs. Trevelyan's courage is wonderful, she never shows the least alarm. When she and Mr. Trevelyan go out in the evening they have a mounted escort, the soldiers riding close to the windows of their carriage.

We heard on our arrival at Dublin Castle that 'His Excellency' had a Council, and that 'Her Excellency' was walking in the Pound, so we went to our rooms till tea-time. The Pound is a gloomy and damp enclosure at the back of the Castle, now the only place in which ladies staying in the house can take exercise out of doors. There are not many people staying here, for when Their Excellencies are in residence there are very few spare rooms, but people come to dinner. To-night we were a party of twenty-four, including the two A.D.C.'s in waiting. The Lord Lieutenant has twelve A.D.C.'s, two being on duty at a time for a fortnight. Their uniform is very becoming, dark blue cloth faced with Irish poplin of the light blue called St. Patrick's, gold braid woven in a design of shamrocks, and gold buttons engraved with the motto of the Order of St. Patrick, *Quis Separabit*. Each Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is the Grand Master of the Order during his term of office; he wears a very fine St. Patrick's star in

diamonds, given by William the Fourth, and a beautiful old badge of the Order in diamonds is hung from a light blue ribbon round his neck. The A.D.C.'s have to arrange the order in which people go in to dinner, sometimes a difficult task here: when dinner is ready they cross the gallery to Lord and Lady Spencer's private suite of rooms, return preceding them, and announce 'Their Excellencies.' Everyone stands and bows or curtsies, His Excellency goes into dinner with the lady of highest rank who is present, and Her Excellency follows immediately after with the principal gentleman. On leaving the dining-room Lady Spencer goes out first, Lord Spencer stands with his back to the table, and all the ladies curtsey as they file past him. When he comes into the drawing-room Lady Spencer rises with the rest, nor do any of the ladies sit down without permission. Whist and round games went on all the evening, but as neither of us care for cards we were allowed to read the newspapers just arrived from England. I went to bed thankful to be safe within the Castle walls.

Dublin Castle.

Tuesday, January 30.—Great precautions are taken here for safety. Every servant, even the ladies-maids, must have a pass to go in or out, and the basement of the Castle is full of police. But it seems natural for soldiers to be about the Castle Yard, and though there are detectives everywhere, their presence is not so obvious as in the grounds of the Chief Secretary's Lodge, where they were skulking behind trees and concealed in the bushes. Colonel Herbert Stewart³ was the A.D.C. on duty at breakfast, an old friend. The Lord Lieutenant held a Levee to-day, and it was very amusing to watch the arrivals. The Lord Mayor of Dublin did appear in a State coach, but most of the other conveyances were wretched; the harness invariably dirty, and often mended with rope or string; the servants muffled in every sort of cloak to conceal deficiencies of livery, wearing hats that evidently did not belong to them, and all without gloves. C. still has the uniform he wore when he was Lord Spencer's private secretary in 1869, so he walked in the imposing procession of the Lord Lieutenant, which we were allowed to watch. We could see all the proceedings through an open door, but as nine hundred gentlemen, save three, attended the Levee in compliment to Lord Spencer, we got no luncheon till half-past three. Mr. Clifford Lloyd, one of the resident magistrates, has arrived: he has lately devised a scheme for the restoration of order and the protection of life and property in Ireland. Not long ago he was dining with the officers quartered at Loughbrea, in Galway. Some of them, knowing that Mr. Lloyd's life was in danger, offered to walk home with him, but he declined. Just as he was leaving the officers, a man passed

³ Afterwards General Sir Herbert Stewart. He was killed at the battle of Abu Klea in Nubia, January 1885.

the door quickly, and silently. Mr. Lloyd fancied that he meant mischief. He kept the man in sight for a time, but when Mr. Lloyd reached his own street he had disappeared. 'The moon was shining brightly on the door of Mr. Lloyd's house, the other side of the street being in deep shadow, and Mr. Lloyd felt convinced that the man was hiding in an archway, ready to shoot him on his own doorstep. Mr. Lloyd ran noiselessly along in the shadow and saw the man, as he had expected, under the archway. 'Mr. Lloyd, who is very powerful, sprang upon him, revolver in hand, threatening to fire unless he would walk before him to the police-station. When the man was searched, a loaded revolver was found upon him, and there could be little doubt as to his object in hiding in the archway, but he could only be punished for carrying arms in a proscribed district. Several attempts were made to blow up Mr. Lloyd's rooms, and after a package containing dynamite was found just inside the front door his landlady requested him to take lodgings elsewhere.'

After the Levee we saw Lord Spencer start for a ride. Two soldiers with their carbines held 'at the ready' rode immediately before him; on his right was the captain of the escort, on his left an A.D.C., both of them armed; his groom followed with five mounted soldiers, each provided with a sword and a revolver. Sometimes Lord Spencer carries pistols on his own saddle. He purposely rides very fast, and the clatter made by his escort is wonderful. One of those who is in most danger here, after Lord Spencer himself, is Mr. Hamilton,⁵ who fills Mr. Burke's place as Permanent Under-Secretary. He gets no exercise during the week except at billiards, or in running round the Castle Yard, but on Sundays he goes for a long walk in the country, accompanied by detectives. A policeman sleeps in the bedroom adjoining his, and he is never left alone during the day.

Wednesday, January 31.—We walked in St. Stephen's Green this morning; it is the aristocratic part of Dublin, but even there we were followed by detectives. After luncheon I took a solitary walk in the Pound, as the other ladies were resting before the Drawing-room which Lord Spencer holds to-night. To get into the Pound I had to apply to the officer on guard inside the Castle, then a soldier and a policeman unlocked first an iron door, and, after that, a spiked iron gate. The gate leads to a bridge over a narrow street, once a brook, which is patrolled by soldiers; in the centre of the bridge is a very high iron gate secured by padlocks and covered all over with long spikes. Within the Pound are a few wretched bushes of lilac and laurel, planted in an ill-kept border surrounding a plot of dirty coarse grass; a gravel walk skirts the high iron railing which encloses

⁴ Mr. Clifford Lloyd was finally obliged to leave Ireland, although it was his native country. In 1885 he went as Governor to Mauritius, afterwards he was British Consul in Kurdistan. He died at Erzeroum in 1891.

⁵ Afterwards Sir Robert Hamilton, K.C.B., Governor of Tasmania 1886 to 1893.

the Pound. Stables are opposite to the Castle, police-barracks at the side, and a more dreary exercising ground can hardly exist outside a prison. I walked round and round for an hour, trying to get the fresh air which does not seem to be found in Dublin; a policeman outside the railings regulated his pace by mine inside. When I went indoors the contrast was great, for preparations were going on for the Drawing-room. We had to dress twice, as we could not dine in our trains: Lady Spencer dined in her own room. One or two of the party in the Castle, including myself, have never been to an Irish Drawing-room, and therefore have to be presented. At half-past nine the whole Castle party assembled outside Their Excellencies' rooms, and we walked in procession, the gentlemen following us in their uniforms. We followed Their Excellencies between lines of people in full dress to the Throne Room, the band playing *God Save the Queen*. Lady Spencer was in white velvet and white satin embroidered with pearls, her train carried by two little pages in St. Patrick's blue. The Sword of State was borne before Lord Spencer by Mr. Trevelyan. After the ladies in the Castle had passed before Their Excellencies we stood behind Lady Spencer, and watched the very pretty scene. The Lord Lieutenant now has only to kiss the ladies who are presented; formerly he had to kiss every lady who attended the Drawing-room. Lady Spencer's train was spread on the throne, so that she did not feel its weight, but we had to stand with ours on our arms, and we were ready to sink by the time the Drawing-room was over. This was not till nearly midnight, as 1,370 persons were present. Very few gentlemen pass in front of the throne, they merely cross the end of the room. Then the procession passed again through the different rooms, and Their Excellencies retired to a well-earned supper in private. We tried to get something to eat in St. Patrick's Hall, but there was such a crowd of hungry people that we had to divide a glass of sherry and a bit of cake between three, for we were too much tired to wait till the general company had finished.

Thursday, February 1, 1883.—Besides all the soldiers and extra police now quartered in Dublin there are three hundred Marines, who have been sent into the city by the advice of Mr. Jenkinson, the head of the Criminal Department.* The Marines are in plain clothes, so they are not easily recognised. Some patrol the streets, and when Lord Spencer's movements are known beforehand Marines are posted in pairs all along his route. One hundred and fifty of them are quartered in a disused bank, from which an entrance has been made into the Castle Yard. During this morning Colonel Caulfeild, the Controller of the Vice-Regal Household, took me over the Castle kitchens. There are nine men-cooks, thirteen women-cooks, and a

* Assistant Under-Secretary for Police and Crime in Ireland, 1882-1885, afterwards Sir Edward Jenkinson, K.C.B.

perfect army of assistants, all of whom are engaged and paid by Colonel Caulfeild,⁷ who also orders all the Castle dinners. We met policemen at every turn; two of them never leave the back door, although it is within the closely guarded Castle Yard. We went into St. Patrick's Hall, which is lofty and finely proportioned, but by daylight the decoration looks dirty and shabby. When the Duke of Abercorn was Viceroy a few years ago, he did some gilding in St. Patrick's Hall at his own expense,⁸ and marked it with his coronet and initials so that the Government should not have the credit of it. The long dinner tables are arranged in the shape of a St. Patrick's Cross, the Lord Lieutenant's place being in the centre, and Lady Spencer's opposite to his. The tables were laid for a hundred and ten guests, and only four table-cloths were used; these cloths are of course specially made of Irish damask, and each costs 86*l*. Two large crimson screens are covered with the magnificent gold plate which came into the Spencer family through Sarah Duchess of Marlborough, the friend of Queen Anne. Lord Spencer has many beautiful pieces of silver plate, as well as a silver dinner-service sufficient for even so large a party as that of to-night. Every Lord Lieutenant is allowed 3,000*l*. for outfit; this time the linen had to be made up. The dinner was so well managed that although we did not sit down till half-past eight it was only ten o'clock when Lord Spencer rose to give the Queen's health at dessert. In the evening there was a dance in the Throne Room: when Lord and Lady Spencer are not dancing they sit on the throne with a great gilt mace set upright on either side, and the Sword of State fixed on brackets across the back.

Mr. Plunket^a told me of an adventure he had in the autumn of last year, 1882. Business had taken him to Westport, on the coast of County Mayo, and he was going on to the next station, Castlebar. Between Westport and Castlebar the train has to travel very slowly, as there is a steep incline, up which the line runs through a cutting. Mr. Plunket left Westport by an evening train, and he noticed that in the compartment behind his there was only one man, who was asleep. He also noticed several men talking together in a corner of the station at Westport, one of whom, just as the train began to move, jumped into the carriage immediately in front of his. Mr. Plunket sat smoking and idly watching the reflection of the lighted windows of the train on the side of the embankment. Presently he saw a line of light, as if the door of the carriage in front of his were ajar, and on looking out he perceived a man's hand on the half-opened door, and a man's face looking towards him. The man, finding that he was observed, gently closed the door. Mr. Plunket determined to watch, and soon he again saw the line of light. He started forward, and found that

⁷ Colonel Hon. James Caulfeild, afterwards seventh Viscount Charlemont.

^a Afterwards Lord Rathmore.

the man was now outside the carriage and creeping along the foot-board. At that moment the engine-driver happened to open the door of the furnace, and in the flood of light which poured out the man saw Mr. Plunket above him. Mr. Plunket said he could never forget the man's look of baffled rage as he crept back to his seat and shut the door. When Mr. Plunket reported the incident at Castlebar he was told that the sleeping man was Mr. John Smith, agent to Lord Sligo,⁹ and that he had recently asked to be relieved from the annoyance of police protection. I have since been told by Lady Sligo that Smith was at the same time agent to another Irish landlord, the owner of a small property, who could not afford to relinquish any of his rents. Shortly after the occurrence related to me by Mr. Plunket, Smith, accompanied by his son, went to carry out an eviction on this property. Two men were waiting for him behind a low wall, and they fired as his car passed. Smith's son shot one of the men dead; the other ran away, but was caught. When he was taken, the red mud of the spot on which he had knelt to fire was still on his trousers, and his face was blackened. Yet at the trial the jury acquitted him. Smith was greatly shaken by this attempt on his life, and about a year afterwards he had a paralytic stroke from which he never recovered.

Friday, February 2, 1883.—Lord Spencer went out with the harriers this morning, driving to the meet in a closed carriage with an escort of soldiers. After luncheon Lady Spencer asked me to drive in State with her. We drove in a barouche and four, with postillions and outriders; an A.D.C. sat opposite to us with his revolver in his hand under the fur rug. Two footmen sat in the rumble behind, each wearing a powerful whistle hung round his neck by a red cord, and with pistols in a holster by his side. Then followed two mounted soldiers with drawn swords in their hands and pistols in their holsters. In this fashion we drove through some of the principal streets in Dublin, and up to the Vice-Regal Lodge. Here we walked for some time in the grounds, where soldiers and police were marching up and down all the gravel walks, and sentry boxes were planted in the flower beds. Afterwards we drove past Kilmainham, where the murderers are now awaiting their trial, and then back along the Liffey, which flows like a stream of ink between walls of dirty granite. Lady Spencer was perfectly composed, and looked as if driving in this way was quite pleasant. Several people dined at the Castle, and though nothing has been said about the Kilmainham trial, there is a sort of impression among us that the mystery is about to be unravelled at last.

Saturday, February 3, 1883.—C. has spent all to-day at Kilmainham Courthouse with Mr. Spencer,¹⁰ hearing the beginning of the trial of the men who were concerned in the Phoenix Park murders. It will make the story more clear if I relate the doings of these men

⁹ The third Marquess of Sligo.

¹⁰ Now Viscount Althorp.

now, although the truth came out very slowly and the details were not fully known till later.

Close investigations have been going on secretly during the past eight months, and twenty-six men were arrested in Dublin by Lord Spencer's warrant on one night in January last. These men, who were scattered all over the city, belonged to a secret society numbering about forty, who called themselves *The Invincibles*. The general meetings of this Society were held in a tavern in Dame Street, nearly opposite to the Lower Castle Yard, but the plans of *The Invincibles* were controlled by a committee of four men, who held their own special meetings at another tavern in Dublin, Little's, in North King Street. The object of these special meetings was always the murder of some person, and in each case a regular Order of Execution was issued by the Committee.

Mr. Forster, who was Chief Secretary for Ireland from 1880 to 1882, was the first on the list of victims. He escaped once because an old man, who was to have given the signal to fire at him as he drove past a particular spot on the Quays in Dublin, failed from sheer fright at the critical moment. On a second occasion Mr. Forster's life was spared because a young lady, his adopted daughter, happened to be with him. A third attempt was baffled by Mr. Forster's going to Kingstown earlier than usual on his way to England. He dined at the Yacht Club at Kingstown before going on board the steamer, and *The Invincibles* waited for him in vain at the railway station in Dublin.

After these disappointments several persons mysteriously disappeared; two men known to be connected with *The Invincibles* were found drowned in the Liffey, and the Dublin police became uneasy. They drew up a report which was sent to Mr. Burke, the Permanent Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, but Mr. Burke thought nothing of their suspicions, and wrote at the end of their report, 'Those men have not the courage of their opinions.' Yet at that very time Mr. Burke himself had been sentenced by *The Invincibles*. The Dublin police became more and more alarmed from secret intelligence which reached them from several quarters, and they urged the arrest of nineteen men. But again Mr. Burke refused to sanction any proceedings. Mr. Burke was an Irishman of great ability, a Catholic, devoted to all the interests of his country, and not less devoted to the duties of his post. His only fault in the eyes of his murderers was that, as an official of the English Government, he had become, as they termed it, 'a Castle rat.' On the other hand, although Mr. Burke did all in his power to crush the strength of the Land League in Ireland, he could not bring himself to believe in crime at his own door.

Eleven of *The Invincibles* were selected to go to the Phoenix Park on the afternoon of Saturday, the 6th of May, 1882, the day on

which Lord Spencer for the second time arrived in Dublin as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It was known to them that Mr. Burke would pass through the Park on his way home to the Under-Secretary's Lodge, where he resided with his sister, and lots were cast as to which of the eleven men should murder him. The lot fell on Joe Brady and Tim Kelly, with Pat Delany and Tom Caffrey as their assistants.

Money was plentiful among *The Invincibles*, and they employed one of their party, who had been a doctor in Ireland, to choose weapons for them in London. He purchased six amputating knives of the largest size and six more of a smaller pattern at a shop in the Strand; twelve revolvers were bought in Oxford Street, and two Winchester rifles in Bond Street, with an ample supply of cartridges. The weapons were smuggled over to Ireland by a woman, and she had to make several journeys between London and Dublin before everything was ready.

The four men who acted as the Committee of *The Invincibles*, and in whose hands were all the arrangements, were James Carey, Dan Curley, Tom Caffrey, and James Mullett.¹¹ Carey was a member of the Town Council of Dublin, a scheming ambitious man; Curley was a working carpenter, Caffrey a general dealer. James Mullett, who acted as chairman, was a thriving publican. The arrangements as to the time and place of Mr. Burke's murder were made by Carey, and it was he who hired Kavanagh and Fitz-Harris. Kavanagh, a simple good-humoured young fellow, was one of the licensed car-drivers of Dublin. Fitz-Harris, nicknamed Skin-the-Goat, was an older man than the rest, and drove his own four-wheel cab. As to the actual murderers, Brady and Kelly, Brady was a man between twenty and thirty, square-built, short-necked, and of exceptional strength: Kelly was a youth of nineteen, acting entirely under the influence of Brady, whom he regarded as a hero. Both Brady and Kelly were good workmen in regular employment, and both were official collectors of the alms in their respective chapels. They were true fanatics, and thoroughly believed that the crime they intended to commit, in the murder of Mr. Burke, was for the good of Ireland.

On the afternoon of Saturday, the 6th of May, 1882, Lord Spencer reached Dublin from London, accompanied by his brother and Lord Frederick Cavendish, and was again sworn in as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It is the custom for the Lord Lieutenant to ride in procession to Dublin Castle for this ceremony, the other officials following in carriages. All business is transacted at the Castle, but it is only used as the Lord Lieutenant's residence during the few weeks after Christmas which are called the Dublin season. After Lord Spencer had been sworn in, he rode off to the Vice-Regal Lodge in the Phoenix Park, followed only by his groom. Mr. Burke, who had met Lord Spencer at the Castle, stayed longer in order to arrange some formal

¹¹ There was another *Invincible* of this name, Joe Mullett, a humpbacked man.

business with Lord Frederick Cavendish, the newly appointed Chief Secretary. When they had finished their work they took a car to the entrance of the Phoenix Park, intending to walk on to the Vice-Regal Lodge, a distance of about a mile.

Neither Carey himself, nor Brady, who had been chosen to commit the murder, knew Mr. Burke by sight: to them he was only a name, but it was the name of 'a Castle rat.' Lord Frederick Cavendish, who had only landed in Ireland that morning, was not expected by them, and was quite unknown to them. One of *The Invincibles*, however, a man named James Smith, knew Mr. Burke, and it was therefore arranged that he and Carey should wait, seated on a bench near the Gough Monument, till Mr. Burke (whose habit of walking home through the Park was well known) should come near. The four men, Brady, Kelly, Delaney, and Caffrey, were seated on the car, which Kavanagh was slowly driving up and down the broad road. O'Brien and three more of *The Invincibles* were lying on the grass close to the raised footpath, and Fitz-Harris kept near, in case the four men inside his cab, who had the revolvers and rifles, should be wanted.

Just after seven o'clock Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke came together on foot into the Park; Mr. Burke was wearing a grey suit, and carrying his walking stick upright against his shoulder, as was his general custom. On the path they met two clerks, one of whom remarked 'Those are Castle swells.' They were talking together earnestly, and the clerks caught the words 'Forster's policy.' As they walked on, Smith said to Carey, 'Tis Burke.' 'Which of them?' asked Carey. 'The man in grey,' replied Smith. Without another word Carey signalled to Kavanagh by a wave of his handkerchief. Kavanagh pulled up, the four men dropped quietly off the car, and as they did so Carey said in a low tone to Brady, '*Mind the man in grey.*'

Brady, Kelly, Delaney, and Caffrey walked abreast along the broad path towards Mr. Burke and Lord Frederick, who were still in close conversation, Brady, who was left-handed, being immediately opposite to Mr. Burke. Just as they were about to meet, Brady stooped as if to tie his shoe; then suddenly raising himself he gripped Mr. Burke by the waist with his right hand, swung him round, and, with the knife which he held in his left hand, stabbed him in the back. Mr. Burke gave one groan (which Carey actually imitated at the trial), and died. Several other wounds were inflicted on him, but this first stab, which penetrated the heart, was the fatal blow and caused instant death.

Lord Frederick Cavendish had started forward, trying to defend Mr. Burke with his umbrella, and Brady, dropping Mr. Burke, turned savagely upon him, stabbing him again and again with the greatest fury. But, in Lord Frederick's case also, the first blow, which was

struck deep into his left side, was fatal. As Mr. Burke fell from Brady's grasp to the ground, young Kelly bent over him and drew his long knife across his throat.

Without a moment's delay the four men, Brady, Kelly, Delaney, and Caffrey, sprang upon Kavanagh's car. He had turned it round, so that the horse's head was now facing the Chapelizod Gate, Dublin being behind. Kavanagh had been flicking his horse with the whip so as to be ready to start, and the car went off at a gallop. He drove out of the Park by the Chapelizod Gate, through the village of Chapelizod, and along the Inchicore Road. When the men felt sure they were not followed, Brady and Kelly got off the car and removed all traces of the crime from their hands and their knives with the wet grass in the ditch. There was not a stain upon their clothes. The knives used were never found, and it is probable that they were thrown into one of the deep pools which are numerous in the Liffey at Chapelizod. Kavanagh drove quietly back to Dublin by a circuitous route, being careful to enter the city at Leeson Park, the most distant point from that chosen for the start in the afternoon. Kelly got off the car at Terenure, in the outskirts of Dublin, and took a tram to his mother's house. Kavanagh returned to his home in Townsend Street, put his horse in the stable, and then, too much exhausted to take off either the harness or his own clothes, he lay down in the straw beside the horse and slept. In the meantime Fitz-Harris had driven his cab with the other men out of the Phoenix Park by the gate in the North Circular Road. The party refreshed themselves at a public-house in Upper Leeson Street, and waited till it was evening. Then Brady, Delaney, and Caffrey met Carey by appointment in a dark corner near the railway station in Westland Row, and gave him their report.

The furious pace at which Kavanagh's car had been driven had attracted the attention of several persons. A child was nearly run over at its mother's door in the village of Chapelizod, and a dog which rushed out barking was killed by the horse's hoofs. The driver of another car, which Kavanagh overtook on the road, said that the men were 'laughing and talking like mad,' and he thought they were drunk. One of the park-keepers, named Godden, had particularly noticed them as they passed, and at the trial he was able to identify both Brady and Kelly, who had faced him as they sat on the car.

At the very moment of the murders Colonel Caulfeild was standing at the window in the Vice-Regal Lodge, and noticed a scuffle on the road. He asked Mr. Courtenay Boyle¹² to go with him to see what was the matter. The two ran together across the lawn, meeting on their way a young man who was rushing towards the Vice-Regal Lodge, and shrieking 'Murder! Murder! Mr. Burke's murdered!' He was a clerk in the Inland Revenue Office in Dublin, who knew

¹² Lord Spencer's private secretary.

Mr. Burke by sight. Colonel Caulfeild and Mr. Boyle jumped down the sunk fence at the bottom of the lawn, crossed the road, and saw the bodies of two men lying in the dust. They thought that the one was Mr. Burke's body, and the other that of his murderer. But Mr. Boyle, kneeling down on the road, looked at the nearest face, and cried out in horror, 'Good God ! it's Lord Frederick.'

Just before Mr. Boyle and Colonel Caulfeild had reached the road, a young telegraphist named Maguire had passed on his bicycle. One glance showed him that a terrible crime had been committed, and, without dismounting, he hurried in search of a policeman. To the first he met he cried, 'Make haste to the Park ! there are two men lying in pools of blood near the Monument.' On that day not a single policeman was on duty in the Phoenix Park, the whole force had been required in Dublin. The Park itself was deserted, except for a few persons walking through, although at a little distance a cricket match and a game at polo had been going on earlier in the afternoon. The horses had only just been taken out of the carriage which had brought Mr. Spencer, Colonel Caulfeild, and Mr. Boyle to the Vice-Regal Lodge, and Lord Spencer ordered it to come round, so that Mr. Burke, whom he imagined to be severely injured, might be brought to the house at once. The telegraphist, Maguire, after meeting the policeman, had gone for help to Steevens's Hospital, which is not far from the Phoenix Park. Mr. Myles, the house-surgeon, reached the spot three-quarters of an hour after the attack on Mr. Burke and Lord Frederick. Mr. Burke was quite dead : Lord Frederick still breathed, but he died as Mr. Myles knelt down beside him.

Lord Spencer sat up the whole of that Saturday night making arrangements in case fresh murders should be attempted, and consulting the few persons at hand whose advice could be of use in such a crisis. Mr. Adye Curran (one of the Dublin magistrates), and Mr. Mallon, the head of the detective force, suggested that every car-driver in the city should be summoned to the Castle, and asked to account for his time on the Saturday afternoon. At that period there were more than four thousand licensed car-drivers in Dublin, and all but one of these answered questions satisfactorily. The one who failed to do so was Kavanagh.

The general outline which I have tried to give of the story of the tragedy on the 6th of May will explain the intense interest taken in the trial now going on. C. wrote the following account of the proceedings on this day, Saturday, the 3rd of February :

'When we went over to Ireland on the 26th of January no clue to the murders had apparently been found. It was therefore with thrilling interest that I heard yesterday, the 2nd of February, from Mr. Jenkinson (the head of the detective police), an outline of the discoveries. I was also told that night that Kavanagh, the driver of the car conveying the murderers, had turned Queen's evidence. The prisoners

were to be brought before the magistrates at Kilmainham Court-house to-day; the Courthouse adjoins the prison, and is connected with it by an underground passage. The passage was lined on either side by police when these prisoners were brought into the Court.

'On Saturday morning, the 3rd of February, C. R. Spencer and I were accommodated on a bench immediately below that upon which the magistrates would take their seats. We arrived a good half-hour before the proceedings began. Our bench, which we alone occupied, was intermediate between the magistrates and the area allotted to the counsel and solicitors. The counsel for the Crown [J. Murphy, Q.C.] sat to the left of us; the counsel for the prisoners to the right, and beyond the lawyers, at the far side of the Court, was the dock, with a table in front of it, on which (as is usual in Ireland) the witnesses were to sit. Presently, before the magistrates appeared, the prisoners came rollicking into Court in a long line, twenty-one in number, with a policeman dividing each prisoner from the next. They took their places anyhow in the dock, coming in with their billycock hats set on one side of their heads, and looking more like a set of young men who had indulged in a drunken orgy over night than a set of conspirators in one of the ghastliest of secret assassinations. They were dressed like respectable artisans, and a few had intellectual countenances, notably Carey, and the two Mulletts. Brady looked like a prize-fighter, yet his was not a repulsive face. Kelly was a beardless youth, who looked up to Brady, just as Brady looked up first to Carey and then to the mysterious Number One, who was Tynan, now safe in America. One man, O'Brien, had a notable physiognomy; he was a tall spare man, with a sallow face and black hair.

'After a few minutes the counsel for the Crown got up, and directed the prisoners to stand as he placed them—first Brady, then Kelly, then Carey, according to their share in the crime. This must have been a trying moment for the prisoners, for it told them that they were found out. Some of them were evidently in fear of an informer among themselves, for they counted their numbers over every time that they appeared in the dock. Brady, however, never lost his self-possession, and he used to signal from his place in a front corner of the dock to the newspaper messengers whenever he saw that the reporters had fresh "copy" ready. The three magistrates entered and took their seats. Then we heard the indictment read for "the wilful murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Thomas Burke," in the formal terms of such documents. It thrilled me to hear it; now for the first time the truth was coming to the light after the inscrutable mystery of so many months.

'The first witness was Kavanagh, the car-driver, who had turned Queen's evidence. He mentioned the four men driven by him to the scene of the murder, and was asked if he could identify them. Turning to the dock Kavanagh named them one by one, pointing to each.

He named Brady first, whereupon Brady gave a savage cry, like that of a wounded wild beast ; it sounds still in my ears. The evidence of Mrs. Hands, the wife of a Dublin tradesman, followed. She was walking with her husband along the raised path in the Phoenix Park, on the 6th of May, when they suddenly came upon four men who were lying on the grass, so close to the path that Mrs. Hands lifted her dress lest it should brush the face of one of them. Mrs. Hands continued : " I turned to my husband and said——" " Never mind what you said ! " cried the Crown counsel, " you made an observation to your husband, of which he took notice." Mr. Jenkinson told me that Mrs. Hands' remark had referred to O'Brien, and that she had said to her husband, " Look at that man ! I shall never forget his face." I also heard that shortly before the trial Mrs. Hands was taken into a large room at Kilmainham in which the prisoners were, with a number of other men. Without waiting to be asked if she could identify any of them, Mrs. Hands instantly pointed to O'Brien, and cried, " There he is ! That's the man I saw." Mrs. Hands was asked if she had seen anyone near the men who were lying on the grass. " Yes," she said, " I saw the Lord Lieutenant ride past." Lord Spencer had not noticed the men, but he had passed close to them on his way to the Vice-Regal Lodge.

'The only other special incident on this first day of the trial was the production by the counsel for the Crown of some of the knives which had been purchased with a view to the murders. He wished to pass them to the counsel for the prisoners, who had asked to examine them, and requested us to take them. C. R. Spencer could not bring himself to touch them, so I took them. They had blades about eight inches long and one inch in width ; the handles were short and rough, made of dark horn. When we returned to Dublin Castle at the close of this first day's trial, I stated my opinion that the evidence we had already heard was sufficient to hang the chief prisoners implicated.

'I was present at Kilmainham on the two following days of the trial, and I observed that Carey took upon himself to alter the order in which, by the direction of the Crown counsel, the prisoners were standing. To my mind it showed the ascendancy of Carey, and the scheming side of him. His action, no doubt, had for its object the throwing of difficulty in the way of identification.

'I never witnessed a scene of greater dramatic interest, or of more intense feeling than this trial, and I trust that I may never see the like again.

'Owing to our return to England I missed being a spectator of the extraordinary scene, and a hearer of the revelations made by Carey, when he, upon the fourth day of the trial, turned informer. At the time, people cavilled at the action of the Government in allowing Carey to save his neck by turning Queen's evidence, but it

was obviously right to do so in the interests of justice, and in the hope of unravelling the proceedings of the secret societies.'

Carey himself was more of a coward than any of the younger *Invincibles* who acted under his orders, yet even he had all the Irishman's contempt for an informer. It was only after he had heard from the dock the evidence of Kavanagh, and after he found that Pat Delaney, one of the murderers, was also ready to reveal what he knew, that he saw that there was no way of escape for himself except in confession. Farrell, another *Invincible*, had already turned informer, and at last Carey forced himself to speak. Even then, he had to be given brandy in an adjoining room before he could tell his story in Court. As Carey passed the dock on the way to the witness-table, Brady, with a yell of fury, attempted to seize him by the throat, and every one of the prisoners cursed him. However, when Carey once began his story he told it clearly enough. His nervousness vanished, and he gave, link by link, the chain of evidence which sealed the fate of the other men. The Crown had provided an able counsel for the prisoners, but his words could carry no weight after Carey's evidence.

Brady was hanged at Kilmainham on the 14th of May, 1883, just a year after the Phoenix Park murders. Curley was hanged on the 18th. His old father, a peasant from the West of Ireland, stood watching near Kilmainham, and as the black flag was hoisted he began a prayer in Irish, in which the kneeling crowd joined. Michael Fagan was hanged on the 28th of May; Caffrey on the 2nd of June; Tim Kelly on the 9th. None of them made any confession.

Carey, for his own safety, was kept for a time in Kilmainham Prison. Then a passage to the Cape was taken for him under an assumed name; he was sent out of Kilmainham at midnight, and, avoiding Dublin, he was conveyed to Kingstown by three stages, in three different cabs. Yet the vessel had hardly reached Port Elizabeth when Carey was shot by an Irishman named O'Donnell, who had been watching for him.

Kavanagh, the car-driver, was sent to Sydney, but the authorities would not allow him to land. He was sent back to England, and shortly afterwards he died in a lunatic asylum, having drank himself into insanity. He was only twenty-three.

Sunday, February 4, 1883.--Service in the chapel of Dublin Castle is not much like service in a church. Their Excellencies sit on chairs of State in a pew like an opera-box, attended by two A.D.C.'s in full uniform; their guests and the household occupy pews in the gallery behind them. After the service Lady Spencer asked me to walk with her in the Pound, and she gave me the following account of her arrival in Ireland last May. On Friday, the 5th, Lord Spencer had an audience of the Queen at Windsor, and he returned to Spencer House only just in time to start for Ireland. Lady Spencer went

with him to Euston, and saw him off, with his brother and Lord Frederick Cavendish. She continued: 'On Saturday, the 6th, I was very busy all day. There were all kinds of arrangements to be made, fresh servants to be thought of, everything to get ready for my going over to Ireland on Wednesday, the 10th. On that Saturday evening I felt wretchedly depressed, quite unlike myself. There were several parties, but I gave them all up and asked my sister to go to the play with me. As we drove up to the Criterion there was rather a crowd. Of course they were only looking at the play-bills, but it suddenly struck me that there was bad news from Ireland, and that they were reading it. I did not hear a word of the play, and I was glad to get home and go to bed. I had locked my door, and on the Sunday morning I was awakened by my maid's knock, a little worrying knocking that kept going on. I called out to her, "What is it? Not bad news from Ireland?" "Yes," she said, "very bad news. I don't know how to tell you." I hurried on my dressing-gown, and asked, "Is my lord all right?" She said yes, and I felt I could bear anything. I tore open the door, and there stood my maid crying, and holding out the *Observer*, with the housekeeper sobbing behind her. I caught the paper from her, and in a moment I had read the news. Before I could realise it, my maid said, "Oh, my lady, you will send for his lordship at once, won't you? He must come back directly." That roused me. I said, "My lord won't come back. Can't you see that it is his duty to stay where he is? Get my things to dress; I shall start for Dublin to-night." People were coming all day, and I was glad never to be alone; I felt I must not let myself go. Sir William Harcourt told me that Mr. Ross of Bladensburg¹³ was coming over with despatches, travelling by a special train in advance of the Irish Mail, and that news should be sent to me from the Home Office. I telegraphed to Spencer that I should start for Dublin at once, but he replied that my going now would only add to his anxiety. So I made up my mind to wait until the day originally arranged. When I arrived at the Vice-Regal Lodge in the early morning I thought I had never seen any place look so peaceful. The view of the mountains was lovely, the trees were in all their fresh green, the lilacs and laburnums just out, everything looking like the beginning of summer. It seemed as if all the terrible grief and anxiety around us must be only some dreadful dream.'

On Sunday morning, the 7th of May, the news of the murders in the Phoenix Park became generally known in Dublin, and prayers for the repose of Mr. Burke's soul were asked in all the Catholic churches in the city. At St. Kevin's Chapel the shock to the aged priest was so great that he fell dead at the altar. The Dublin newspapers for the first time in their history published a Sunday edition, but one fact was concealed by them all. This was that, late on the evening of

¹³ The senior A.D.C. in Dublin.

Saturday, the 6th of May, a black-edged card had been dropped into the letter-boxes of the three leading newspapers. The card was written by Dan Curley, and it bore these words: 'This deed was done by the Irish Invincibles.'

On the Monday two placards were posted all over Dublin. One, issued by Lord Spencer on behalf of the Government, contained an offer of 10,000*l.* reward for the discovery of the murderers. The other, signed by Mr. Parnell and several members of the Land League in Ireland, denounced the crime in fitting terms. They honestly deplored the murders, and the crime had shattered their policy.

On Thursday, the 11th of May, Lord Frederick Cavendish was buried at Edensor, the village close to Chatsworth. The whole House of Commons, of which C. was then a member, travelled down with the Speaker, to pay a last tribute of respect to one who had been beloved by all who knew him.

JULIA ROUNDELL.

THE STORY OF THE LABOUR PARTY

THE creation in the House of Commons of a Labour group, equipped with the appropriate symbols and machinery of a political party, marks a new and interesting epoch in the Parliamentary history of our country.

To the superficial observer it seems strange that the greater enlightenment of the working classes, the favouring conditions of a democratic franchise, and the growth of great and wealthy trade societies have not much earlier resulted in the formation by Labour of a distinct Parliamentary organism ; but to the more diligent student of political and social phenomena many conclusive reasons present themselves, not only to explain its belated appearance, but to suggest doubts as to its probable continuity.

A political party can possess little vitality unless it be representative of opinion in favour of, or hostile to, some definite policy. If it have identical or generally similar aims to those of another association of men it is only a section or division of that other association, and generally the vitality of each must be impaired by the existence of the other.

Neither can a party exist otherwise than in name for the attainment of ends which, by common consent, are impracticable. By way of illustration, a society may be founded for the exploration of the mountain ranges of Africa ; to another society founded for the same object may be superadded the further object of exploring the mountains in the moon. It is obvious that this second society would merely be a competing body with the first, enjoying no justification for its existence except in so far as it might co-operate with or supersede the first in seeking the attainment of the common object.

There is no difficulty in classifying as distinct political parties the Conservative, the Liberal, and the Irish. The Conservative still generally represent the forces of conservation, the Liberal those of innovation, while the Irish party is the exponent of a policy of great constitutional changes repugnant to the Conservative, and, at the present time, to a preponderant portion of the Liberal party. Further, on many questions affecting religion and economics the Irish party

is in conflict with one or both of the English parties, and consistently assumes an attitude either of aloofness from, or pronounced hostility to, English policy, be it domestic or foreign.

In the absence of definite and distinct aims, the mere assumption of the machinery and paraphernalia of party by a group of individuals wholly fails to endow that group with the essential attributes of a political party. Thus, some time ago, the Liberal members for Wales, emulating the example of the Irish members, formally resolved themselves into a party ostensibly nationalist; but their mimic organisation wholly failed to segregate its members from the Liberal party, for the obvious reason that they had no distinctive policy or programme, their nationalist aims were trivial and unreal, and their aspirations for the disestablishment of the Welsh Church were only part of a larger policy in the pursuit of which they worked in unison with the general forces of Liberalism.

Intermittently and spasmodically it is true that a group of members may enjoy the essential attributes of a party. Some question may, and occasionally does, arise when a group of members, be it Welsh, or Radical, or Socialist, may separate itself from the political party with which it usually acts, and for the occasion be a distinct and self-contained entity. But to describe such a combination, existing only for some special and transitory purpose, as a political party would be a misuse of terms; it is merely a temporary defection or mutiny, embarrassing to the party of which the malcontents are members, and occasionally destructive of an administration.

If the foregoing accurately describes the essential qualities of a political party, we may properly inquire whether the group of persons which, indued with the necessary administrative equipment of a political organism, has described itself as 'the Labour party,' fulfils the conditions which may entitle it to be regarded as a distinct political party.

The purely political aims of Labour are almost attained, and the Labour leader of to-day no longer seriously concerns himself with questions of franchise, the machinery of elections, the constitution of the legislature, or even payment of members. He is satisfied that the workman enjoys paramount political power, and with that power can make Parliament—*i.e.*, the House of Commons—which is his creature, the executor of his will.

The problem of which he seeks solution is economic. It may be stated in the form of a question, as propounded by the late Henry Fawcett in one of his lectures on 'The Economic Position of the British Labourer': 'How is it that the vast production of wealth does not lead to a happier distribution? How is it that the rich seem to be constantly growing richer, while the poverty of the poor is not perceptibly diminished?'

The dreamer of dreams finds an immediate solution in a system

of State socialism, an absolute extinction of individual rights, and, in substitution for these, the unlimited power of society to employ and direct human energy. The Jacobin of France kindled his incendiary torch at the sacred fires of idealistic philosophy, and compassed the ruin of the mediæval noble, only to witness his rule superseded by the more oppressive and firmer domination of 'the economic man.' But the Labour leader of to-day has profited by the errors of his predecessors; he may, indeed, fire the imagination of the proletariat by revealing to them visions of a perfected social state, but, on the whole, his policy is practical, definite, and moderate.

The title 'The Labour Party' has been assumed by an organisation under the leadership of Mr. Keir Hardie, and its creation was coincident with the development of a movement for co-operation among trade unions in order to further by political or Parliamentary action the common interests of Labour; it is a movement to substitute the national combination of trade unions for the sectional action which has hitherto characterised their policy. The movement is not, indeed, of recent origin. It was against this sectional and purely economic action of trade unions that the Chartists, whose legitimate successors the Labour party claims to be, unsuccessfully strove; for until recently a trade union has been little more than the concrete expression of those employed in a particular trade to regulate wages, working hours, and other details of their industry, and the outcome of the effort of the labouring classes to counteract the policy of employers to reduce wages and increase hours. As Adam Smith observed in *The Wealth of Nations*: 'Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform combination not to raise the wages above their actual rate.'

Despite the resistance of employers, the subjection of the working classes, and the protests of the doctrinaire economist, Parliament, while yet trade unionism was in its infancy, recognised that the rigid rules of economy applicable to the interchange of commodities could not in the relations between labour and capital be absolutely enforced. Intermittently, tentatively, and timidly, by a series of restrictive measures dating from 1802, Labour became partially emancipated from the thralldom imposed by the capitalist and justified by the theorist.

After the repeal of the combination laws in 1824 trade unions steadily multiplied and prospered. They manifested, however, no disposition to respond to the appeal of the Chartists for combined effort in political action; they displayed rather a tendency to discountenance all political activity, and each union took up a position of isolation, neither seeking from, nor affording to, other trade unions assistance in their conflicts with employers.

The Chartists bitterly resented this sectional attitude of trade unions, and for long regarded their growth with jealousy and distrust:

There have been many partial trade movements in this country, but they have one and all lacked that powerful element which gives strength to the combined few—they have lacked combination from the ignorant presumption, firstly, that the attempt would tend to excite the wrath and strong resistance of the masters, and, secondly, that those of different callings had no interest in common.

From the inception of their movement the Chartists took up the position that only by political action could the working classes secure an improved social status. Free Trade, co-operation, trade combinations, even electoral reform, short of manhood suffrage, were in their nature reactionary agencies tending in the direction of monopoly and class privilege.

All trade unions are lamentable fallacies whether they embrace 1,000 men or 1,000,000; all co-operative efforts are waste, misdirection of time, means and energy under our present governmental system; even when they flourish locally it is only for a time and to supplant old evils by new ones.

Such was the language of the Chartist leader in those days of political apathy and indifference that immediately succeeded the collapse of the revolutionary movement of 1848. Not less trenchant was his denunciation of Cobdenism, founded not, indeed, as Mr. Chamberlain has suggested, upon any inherent distrust of Free Trade, but on the ground that the incidence of taxation and the distribution of wealth required readjustment as a condition precedent to freedom of exchange.

During the heat of Free Trade agitation we adhered to the doctrine that the capricious adoption of the principle, unaccompanied by prudent and necessary concessions and fair adjustment, would firstly pauperise the manual labourer; secondly, would make bankrupts of the small shopkeepers, who depend for profit and existence upon the state of the labour market; thirdly, would reduce the farming class to beggary; fourthly, would confiscate the property of the landlords to Jew jobbers, moneymongers and mortgagees; fifthly, would convince the Free Trade manufacturers that they had 'caught a Tartar.'

The institution of household suffrage in the boroughs under the Reform Act of 1868 aroused the political activity of the working classes, and in 1869 trade unions to some extent abandoned their attitude of *laissez faire* in political affairs, and were instrumental in founding a body called the 'Labour Representation League,' formed for the purpose of promoting the return of working men to Parliament. It met with some success, and in 1874 two working men were elected—Mr. Burt for Morpeth, and Mr. Macdonald for Stafford.

The extension of household suffrage to the counties resulted in a considerable increase of Labour representatives. The coal-mining industry was exceptionally active, and from the coalfields of Northumberland, Durham, Yorkshire, and South Wales leading trade unionists of conspicuous ability entered Parliament. Until the formation of the 'Labour Representation Committee' in 1900, the Labour members, with one or two exceptions, belonged to the Liberal party, and were

subject to its discipline. They entered Parliament as Liberals, with a special mandate from those who sent them to promote the interests of the particular trade to which they belonged, and generally assist the cause of Labour. For the most part they were the nominees of the trade unions situate in their constituencies, and of which they were officials or members. Moreover, they received a stipend for their maintenance from their respective unions, which also bore their election expenses. Under such conditions the position of a Labour member is one of no mean distinction, singled out by their fellow men, among whom they have lived and laboured, for the high honour of a seat in Parliament and maintained by their free offerings.

In 1893 an organisation came into existence destined to play a conspicuous part in awakening political activity among the working classes, and directing the energies of trade unions towards political combination. The Independent Labour Party was formed at Bradford. Its members were for the most part in sympathy with Socialism, but its immediate and definite purpose was to form in Parliament a Labour party wholly independent of the Liberal or Conservative parties, but ready to act with or against either, as the interests of Labour might dictate.

The Independent Labour party was not the offspring of trade unions ; its authors were a few ardent spirits, some under the influence of Continental Socialism, all more or less inheritors of the Chartist tradition that union with the middle class in political action constitutes an insuperable obstacle to the attainment of the political and economic purposes of Labour. The members of this party did not shrink from assailing the trade-union members ; they accused them of consciously or unconsciously playing into the hands of the Liberal party ; they drew no distinction between Liberal and Conservative, both capitalists, both the enemies of Labour ; they charged the trade unionists with neglecting the interests of the working class and devoting themselves solely to the narrow and selfish interests of their own respective industries.

But it was obvious that the Independent Labour party, whether by itself or in combination with other Socialistic groups, could do little towards the construction of a Labour party in the House of Commons. Its financial resources were unequal to the task, and without the co-operation of trade unionists it could not hope to secure suitable candidates. It set itself with energy to the task of capturing the trade unions, and carried on throughout the country an active propagandism.

For some time its efforts in this direction met with little success. Trade-union leaders, for the most part strong individualists, regarded with disdain the wild talk of the 'scientific Socialist,' and looked askance at the leaders of the movement, many of whom had never been associated with manual labour. It is probable, indeed, that the efforts of the Independent Labour party to promote political action

on the part of trade unions would have been as futile as those of the Chartists fifty years earlier, had it not been for the alarm created among trade unionists by a series of judicial decisions that threatened not merely to impair the right of combination among workmen, but even to imperil the continued existence of their great organisations. In the year 1899 the Trade Union Congress passed a resolution in favour of the institution of a Labour party in Parliament, and as a result of this action the 'Labour Representation Committee,' now entitled the 'Labour Party,' was formed. At its inauguration in 1900 it consisted of representatives of trade unions and trade councils, the Independent Labour party, the Social Democratic Federation, and the Fabian Society. Later on local Labour representation committees became entitled to representation on the committee, but the Social Democratic Federation seceded because Socialism did not constitute an integral part of its policy.

The object of the "Labour Party," as declared in their constitution, is as follows :

To secure by united action the election to Parliament of candidates promoted in the first instance by an affiliated society or societies in the constituency, who undertake to form or join a distinct group in Parliament with its own Whips and its own policy on Labour questions, to abstain strictly from identifying themselves with or promoting the interests of any section of the Liberal or Conservative or Unionist or Nationalist parties and not to oppose any other candidate recognised by the committee. All such candidates shall pledge themselves to accept this Constitution, to abide by the decisions of the group in carrying out the aims of this Constitution, and to appear before their constituencies under the title of Labour Candidates only.

The first year after its institution the Labour party represented a trade-union membership of about 36,000; its present membership is little short of 1,000,000. The great mining organisations still stand aloof, and it remains to be seen whether the energetic efforts of the Labour party to bring them into line will prove successful.

From the various trade unions and other organisations that affiliate themselves to the Labour party a fund is raised from which their Parliamentary representatives receive a portion of their election expenses and an annual stipend for their maintenance. The selection of candidates appears to be primarily in the hands of the Labour organisation in the constituencies for which they seek election, but local freedom of choice is strictly limited to candidates who accept the constitution of the Labour party and are approved by its executive committee.

There is now established, in the interests of Labour, a highly organised, well equipped, and intelligently directed political union possessing a Parliamentary representation of twenty-nine members who have bound themselves to act in complete independence of other political parties.

The 'Labour party' does not, however, include all the Labour members. The class of Labour members of which Messrs. Burt and

Macdonald were the pioneers have been returned to the present Parliament in greatly increased numbers; the majority of them are miners, but other industries are well represented. As already observed, they are members of the Liberal party, but resolve themselves into a distinct and independent party upon all questions that immediately affect the interests of Labour.

The Labour party and the Liberal-Labour members respectively represent distinct points of view upon Labour policy; the former insist that the interests of Labour can be effectively promoted only by creating a House of Commons mainly constituted of Labour members, or, if that be impracticable, by returning Labour members numerically strong enough to coerce the Liberal and Tory parties to concede the demands of Labour; they contend that the middle and upper classes, to whatever political party they may belong, are the natural enemies of Labour, and will grant no reform save at the dictate of force or fear. The Liberal-Labour members on the other hand believe that the policy of permeation and persuasion applied to the Liberal party will be more effective in advancing the interests of Labour than that of isolation and antagonism, and that the diminution of the strength of Liberalism does not involve an increase of power to the forces of Labour, but to those of monopoly and reaction.

Whatever may be the merits of this controversy as to policy between the two sections of Labour members, there is no foundation for the charge frequently made by members of the Labour party that the Liberal-Labour members are better servants of Liberalism than of Labour. A retrospect of the past thirty years will demonstrate the signal services rendered to the industrial classes by Mr. Burt and his colleagues. Nor must it be forgotten in considering their services that the House of Commons is profoundly changed from what it was in the early days of the struggle by Labour for legislative reforms. Before the extension of the franchise in 1885 the House was composed almost exclusively of landowners, great employers and professional men of high position; since then, literary men, journalists, lawyers, and many others entirely free from the influence of capital, constitute a preponderating part of the Liberal and no insignificant part of the Conservative party.

In the amendment of the laws relating to trade unions and the right of combination by workmen, the statutory regulation of coal mines, factories and workshops, the protection of women and children from onerous conditions of work, the increased inspection of mines, factories and railways, the promotion of legislation that led to the passing of the Workmen's Compensation Act, the development of the Labour department of the Board of Trade, the institution of the 'Labour Gazette,' and the grant of increased sanitary powers to municipalities, the trade-union members played a conspicuous part. Without the pomp and circumstance of a party organisation this little unit of Labour men made up for lack of numbers by a tact and courtesy

that conciliated the most pronounced antagonist of Labour, by a reasonableness that disarmed opposition, by a moderation of demand that inspired confidence and encouraged concession, and by patience and perseverance that in result has placed upon the Statute-book no insignificant number of measures conducing to the moral and material advancement of the working classes.

The remarkable results of the last General Election, when the Labour members increased in number from less than twenty to more than fifty, have given rise to a wide impression that Labour is destined at no distant date to occupy a commanding, if not predominant, position in the House of Commons. It is more than doubtful whether this impression be well founded. It is undoubtedly within the power of the great trade unions, even without spontaneous or even sympathetic action on the part of the electorate, to secure the return of a very considerable number of members for those constituencies where Labour is highly organised; from the mining districts of England it would probably need but little effort on the part of the local trade unions to send twice or even three times the number of miners' representatives, and the same observation is true in somewhat less degree of the textile industries; but this would be the result of trade-union effort only in certain prescribed areas where Labour is highly organised and homogeneous, in constituencies where Labour organisation is non-existent or divided among various trades the future of Labour representation is less assured. The past treatment by constituencies of this character of such representative men as Mr. S. Woods, Mr. George Howell, Mr. Maddison, and Mr. Steadman, unless we are to credit a sudden and permanent change in the attitude of the working classes towards Labour representation, is not calculated to encourage expectations that the Labour party is likely to assume large proportions.

The increased number of Labour representatives in the Parliament of 1906 is due to two main causes of a purely transient character; the first, but the least effective, was the genuine alarm on the part of working men that their right of combination and the funds of their unions were endangered by certain judicial decisions, and hence trade unions made an energetic effort to return Labour men to vindicate the rights of Labour; the second was the general unpopularity of the Tory party. It is noteworthy that out of twenty-nine members belonging to the Labour party only five were opposed by Liberals, while out of twenty-one unsuccessful Labour candidates, all belonging to the Labour party, thirteen polled a smaller number of votes than the Liberal candidates. And in every case, save one, where the Conservative got in, the Liberal vote was larger than the Labour. It is perhaps no unfair inference to draw from these facts that had all the candidates of the Labour party been opposed by Liberals, a much smaller number would have been successful.

But apart from speculation upon the results of the last Election, is there any reason to anticipate that the Labour party will become a

permanent and powerful factor in the House of Commons? The true answer to this question is to be found in the answer to the further question whether there is a necessity in the interest of the working classes for the existence of a third party constituted and controlled solely in the interests of Labour. It must be observed that the expression Labour party is used in contradistinction to Labour members; it is not only reasonable, but inevitable, that able and distinguished men, be they of the trade-union order like Messrs. Burt, Fenwick, and Wilson, or of the new Labour party, like Messrs. Hudson, Walsh, and Shackleton, should be elected by their fellow men to serve in Parliament. But is it a necessity for the working man that there should be a Labour party in the House of Commons? The answer to this question seems to be that there is no scope or adequate occupation for a Labour party in English politics. With regard to the ultimate aims of a section of the Labour party, that is, the substitution of State collectivism for individualism, this clearly is outside the sphere of Parliamentary action. It is wholly impossible in our present social state to propound a practical scheme for the nationalisation of land and other means of production, and it is perfectly certain that the Labour party will not attempt to do so; many preliminary problems would have to be solved by legislation, much progress would have to be made in national morality, processes which must extend over many coming generations of men before great economic and ethical changes of this character could be compassed.

But if we descend the heights of philosophic idealism and keep within the calm area of practical politics we may inquire what in the nature of a policy or programme have the Labour party to offer which in kind or quality places them in a distinction from one, or some may say both, of the great political parties.

Although during Mr. Balfour's administration the Conservative party largely abandoned the social legislation by which Lord Beaconsfield successfully conciliated the working classes to the Conservative cause, both parties in the State strive to meet the demands of the electorate. Each party is a competing purveyor to satisfy the appetite of the proletariat, and, however naturally indisposed individuals composing either party may be to satisfy some demand that conflicts with their interests, they have to elect whether they will remain loyal to their party or abandon it, and they generally select the former alternative. In truth, social legislation has made remarkable progress since the electoral reform of 1868, even without the quickening influence of a Labour movement, and no clearer demonstration of this fact, nor of the reforming zeal of the great political parties, can be found than in the identity of the Labour policy with that of the Liberal, and, in a less degree, of the Conservative party.

The Labour party, recognising their inability to propound a programme differing from that of the Liberal party, have wisely refrained

from attempting to formulate one. In what may be taken as an authoritative exposition of the policy and position of the Labour party, an essay, written by Mr. Macdonald, M.P., one of its Whips, he observes :

The party has hitherto refused to compile a programme, for the very sufficient reason that a party is not created upon a programme, but upon a point of view. Not pledges but standpoints gain the confidence of the people. But the party has made certain demands which indicate with great accuracy what its programme will be when the time comes to formulate it.

It has backed the Trade Disputes Bill, which seeks to restore trade unions to a footing of legal equality with Capital; it has taken a decisive stand in favour of the State recognising its responsibility to the unemployed; it has made itself responsible for the practical agitation in favour of the provision of meals for needy schoolchildren at the public expense. A conference of its candidates, held some eighteen months ago, agreed upon proposals regarding Chinese Labour, Taxation and National Expenditure, the Franchise, Education, Workmen's Compensation, and one or two other subjects. Amongst the leaflets officially issued by the party are some advocating Old Age Pensions, Railway and Land Nationalisation, &c.; whilst the opposition which the party has offered to Mr. Chamberlain differed from the ordinary Free Trade position, inasmuch as it involved an attack upon the private ownership of mining rents and royalties, the unfair incidence of home railway charges, and led the workers to consider problems of wealth distribution instead of tariffs.

Now, apart from the references to railway and land nationalisation, and the substitution of State for private ownership of property, projects however meritorious at present *ex concessu* outside the realms of practical politics, there is nothing in the above-quoted demands 'which indicates with great accuracy what its programme is to be,' that differentiates the policy of the Labour from that of the Liberal party. Old-age pensions, educational reform, adjustment of taxation, feeding of schoolchildren, workmen's compensation, support of the unemployed, international arbitration—all these are accepted items of the Liberal programme, and some of them are already in course of legislative treatment. Upon programme, therefore, the Labour party is unable to claim any advantage over Liberalism, or, indeed, in respect of many of the items, Conservatism.

But in justice to the Labour party it must be conceded that if they fail to discriminate between their formulated policy and that of the Liberal party, they confidently assert superiority of methods; they aver in this same essay that there is on the part of the Liberal party a great difference 'between promises and performances, programmes and Acts of Parliament,' and that it is adequate justification for their existence that they should be the means of quickening the legislative activity of the Liberal party. If such be the end and aim of their existence, it is a little difficult to understand why it should be a part of the policy of the Labour party to oppose Liberals indiscriminately with Tories at Parliamentary elections, and thus weaken the instrument which they propose to use for the attainment of their political ends.

Whether or no the Labour party be a reactionary agency, tending

rather to impede than to facilitate the advancement of Labour, there is little doubt that it will, for this Parliament at least, constitute an effective political force. It comprises within its ranks men of singular ability and richly endowed with those attributes which carry weight in a legislative assembly, and upon the Labour legislation with which the House of Commons is immediately concerned it can exercise a wholesome influence. There lurks within it, however, the germ of disruption. It is constituted upon the caucus system, a central authority granting credentials to candidates, controlling and dispensing the fund for the maintenance of those elected, dictating the conduct of members upon all questions of legislative and administrative policy; all this must be subversive of the responsibility of members to their constituents, and therefore of the influence of constituents upon their members. The Labour members outside the Labour party enjoy a practical independence even greater than that of the ordinary party man—they owe allegiance to none but their constituents; but members of the Labour party are by their constitution subject to the control of a cabal or caucus that must in every party so constituted invariably be the dominant force. However reasonable and judicious that control may be, it is irksome to the man of independent mind, while there is always the probability that control of this kind may degenerate into despotism, the sure forerunner of disruption. Moreover, the Labour party have made the dangerous experiment of admitting men to their party who do not belong to the working classes. It is a bold and generous course, and it may well be that the journalist or man of letters is animated by equally high motives in his political services as the trade-union official; but the moral force that men like Mr. Burt wield in the House of Commons and the country when they plead the cause of Labour rests not with them, nor can it be doubted that the inclusion of persons of this type in the party may take the control of the Labour movement in Parliament out of the hands of the sober, thoughtful, and sincere men who have hitherto guided it and relegate it to the tender mercies of reckless and self-interested adventurers.

This, indeed, is the era of social reform. Much has already been done to ameliorate the condition of the poor, at their homes, their places of labour, in all that pertains to their moral, mental, and physical well-being. The wild words of the Socialist, the avarice of the capitalist, the monitions of the doctrinaire economist, will not sensibly control the action of Parliament nor govern public opinion.

A broader education of the people, a larger knowledge of the conditions of society, loftier conceptions of duty, the labours of the philanthropist, the investigations of the statistician—these have been the contributory causes to a general movement in favour of social reform, a movement representing the general sentiment of the nation, of which the constitution of a Labour party is but one of many manifestations.

L. A. ATHERLEY-JONES.

THE GOVERNMENT TRADE DISPUTES BILL

MANY people acclaimed the famous Taff Vale decision as a notable act of justice. But they merely looked at the laconic judgment of the Lord Chancellor :

If the Legislature has created a thing which can employ servants, which can own property, which can employ servants, which can inflict injury, it must be taken, I think, to have impliedly given the power to make it suable in a court of law for injuries purposely done by its authority and procurement.

The real nature of the decision has, however, to be tested by reference to the conditions under which trade unions had existed, and the particular circumstances under which the legalising Act was passed in 1871. When such a reference is made, it will be found that the decision involved three great and essential hardships :

(1) It saddled unions with corporate liabilities, while the fourth section of the Trade Union Act, 1871, expressly deprived them of the rights and privileges of corporations.

(2) It placed trade unions in a legal position different from all other non-corporate associations.

(3) It made unions liable for the acts of officers under constitutions which had been loosely framed upon a thirty years' assumption, by lawyers as well as public, that Parliament had intended no such liability, and that in fact no such liability existed.

All these hardships could be removed by legislation in one of two ways. Either a measure could be passed removing the corporate disabilities of the Act of 1871 and clothing the unions with all the rights and privileges and attributes of corporate bodies ; or they could be put back into the old position they were assumed to occupy of being non-suable like other non-corporate bodies.

A third course was merely to modify the hardships by dealing with the law of agency as applicable to unions as recommended by the Royal Commission appointed by Mr. Balfour's Government.

No one could reasonably quarrel with the justice of converting the unions into complete corporate bodies. The practical inconveniences of doing so would, however, probably be very great. There would,

of course, be the advantage that contracts relating to conditions of employment would be enforceable against the union collectively, whether it consisted of employers or workmen. Actions of tort would also be maintainable for the wrongful acts of officers and agents. The inconveniences would largely be with matters of internal administration. The unions would have the right of enforcing payment of subscriptions against their members. This power of compulsion would change the whole basis of unions, which theoretically are voluntary associations resting entirely upon personal consent. Members would also have the right of enforcing the payment of benefits from the union. Members differing with the policy of executive or district or branch committees, or officers, and questioning whether they were acting strictly according to rule, might often be induced to exploit the possibilities of the injunction to restrain them from pressing certain lines of action. Employers, having entered into agreements with the union as a whole, might find themselves threatened with actions for injunctions and damages for breach of contract for any simple variation of such agreements in the case of individual members of such unions. They would be open to attack in the courts by the unions for inducing men to break their contracts of membership with the union, and men could be served with injunctions for refusing to strike in accordance with the rules of the union, or returning to work during a strike. Thus courts would have thrust upon them problems of social and industrial policy in thousands, and possibly hundreds of thousands of cases, problems with which, from the nature of things, they are not competent to deal.

I venture to say all these consequences would be inevitable if Lord Lindley's suggestion that unions should be allowed to register as joint-stock companies were adopted. Personally, I am far from saying that these inconveniences are fatal to such a proposal, but their full effect can scarcely be realised by some of those who so readily advocate the registration of unions under the Joint Stock Companies Acts.

Equally no real quarrel can, I think, be found with the justice of placing the unions in the position of non-suability they were assumed to occupy prior to Mr. Justice Farwell's notable decision. It was clearly the position intended for them by Parliament in 1871, however clumsily that intention was expressed in the Act of that year. Sir Godfrey Lushington, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Mr. George Howell, and Mr. Robert Applegarth, who had a great deal to do with that Act, are all unanimous on the point, and no one who had anything to do with the measure has questioned their testimony.¹ This is Sir Godfrey Lushington's declaration :

¹ For more detailed evidence of the intention of Parliament in 1871, see article 'Should Trade Unions be Incorporated?' *Nineteenth Century and After*, February 1902.

This [Taff Vale] decision is, of course, law, and it is not for me to question its correctness. But I may be permitted to say that the intention thus attributed, by judicial inference, to Parliament was, in my belief, contrary to what was the intention in fact. Few, I think, can doubt this who read Lord Aberdare's speech in introducing the measure; and as a matter of history the question of the liability of trade union funds was not publicly mooted either before or during the proceedings of Parliament, and indeed not afterwards for thirty years. At the time it was not dreamt of. If any proposition of the sort had been started it would have been strongly opposed.²

Such a return to the ante-Taff Vale position would also be the same for the masters as for the men, for the 900 trade unions of employers as for the 1,300 unions of workmen, for the Taff Vale decision applies equally to the unions of both.

More than this, it would simply put trade unions, in regard to the law of torts, in precisely the same position as that now occupied by all other non-corporate societies, such as social, athletic, and political clubs, political associations, and so forth. The Cobden Club and the Tariff Reform League, the Liberal Federation and the Central Conservative Association are not suable as such, though they libel or slander or otherwise tortiously wrong their opponents to any extent. The individual or individuals committing the tortious wrong are alone amenable to the law.

With practical unanimity the forces of organised labour declared for 'as you were'—a return to the legal status enjoyed prior to Taff Vale. They introduced a Bill to give effect to this, and carried its second reading by a substantial majority last year. The Liberal leaders pledged themselves to this form of legislation. One quotation will suffice. The Premier, speaking at Wrexham on the 12th of January, 1906, said :

All we ask is that they (the trade unions) should be relieved from the effect of recent judicial decisions, and that the workmen's combinations should be placed again in the position relative to the employers, that Parliament intended them to be placed in thirty years ago.

The question I now desire to put is this : Does the Government Trade Disputes Bill effectively redeem this pledge ? The present fourth clause of that measure was introduced for the professed purpose of doing so. On the second reading Sir William Robson said, ' We [the Government] are determined to restore to trade unions the security that the statesmen of 1871 intended them to have.' More than this, I am fully convinced that the leaders of the Government are sincerely of opinion that this clause fully and frankly redeems their pledge, and secures to the unions that immunity from litigation which they enjoyed up to Mr. Justice Farwell's decision. Whether the draftsman of the clause holds the same optimistic view I have no means of telling. But in my humble opinion the clause does nothing of the sort. I go further, and venture to say that if the

² *The National Review*, January 1902.

clause passes in its present form it will be nearly as easy to maintain actions for injunctions and the recovery of damages against trade unions as it is to-day. Here is the clause as it now stands :

4. *Prohibition of actions of tort against trade unions except in certain circumstances.*—An action against a trade union (or any branch thereof) whether of workmen or masters, or against any members or officials thereof on behalf of themselves and all other members of the trade union for the recovery of damages in respect of any tortious act alleged to have been committed by or on behalf of the trade union, shall not be entertained by any court—provided that nothing in this section shall affect the liability of the trustees of such unions to be sued in the events provided for by the Trades Union Act, 1871, section 9.

It will be remembered that this clause is not the fourth clause as it was originally introduced in the Bill. That clause did not pretend to make unions non-suable. It merely sought to limit the law of agency as applied to them. It set up what the Attorney-General aptly called a 'series of barbed-wire entanglements,' through which a plaintiff would have to wriggle his way to get at the union funds for the wrong done him by an official. That clause was not regarded by the Liberals or Labour men as being an adequate redemption of the Government pledge to give the unions the *status quo ante* Taff Vale. But it is a remarkable fact that the marginal note descriptive of that clause has been retained to describe the present clause: 'Prohibition of actions of tort against trade unions—except in certain circumstances.' I believe the note to be accurately descriptive of the clause as it stands, and this I hope to show in a moment or two. But it does not express the Government pledge. Before the Taff Vale case it was understood that unions were not suable. They had no distinct entity or legal existence, apart from their individual members, of which courts could take cognizance. But this marginal note clearly contemplates that they shall be suable, and suable in tort 'in certain circumstances.' In other words, according to this marginal note the Taff Vale judgment is to stand in all its nakedness—'unions may be sued.' It decided nothing more than that. That was the change it imported into law. It was in truth a veritable revolution. But if the fourth clause is correctly described by this marginal note, the revolution is to be accepted, and the word of promise that it should be reversed, which was made to the ear of organised labour, is to be broken to their hope by the adroitness or strange oversight of the draftsman of the clause.

The clause consists of two parts. The first part deals with the prohibition of actions. The second part consists of a proviso. It will be noticed that whatever prohibitions are made in the first part are made subject to the proviso in the second part.

Now, by the first part, the only actions which the courts are not to entertain, are actions 'for the recovery of damages.' Actions for

injunctions are not prohibited. Neither are actions for declarations of indemnity. I will deal with the latter when I come to discuss the proviso. The fact that actions for injunctions are not prohibited is serious and significant. Used to its fullest extent the weapon of the injunction may be very much more hurtful to a union than an action for damages. It will do much more to cripple the efficacy of a strike. The action for damages comes at the end of a strike. The injunction is used early in the fray. In a properly laid case upon a carefully drawn series of affidavits a union may find itself prohibited by injunction from providing the sinews of war to carry on a strike perfectly lawful in itself, but in connection with which certain unlawful acts may have been committed by individuals, over whom they have no control. An injunction under such circumstances may cause the collapse of a strike, with the result that the men, angry at such a collapse, will leave the union in large numbers. This has been the experience in American strikes over and over again. There the injunction in a strike has been developed as a weapon of great art and power. And unless it is prohibited against the unions here, it needs no wisdom to predict that its far-reaching possibilities will be exploited to the utmost under the pressure of the feelings engendered by, and the great interests often involved in, our great industrial conflicts.

But even the prohibition of actions for the recovery of damages is, I believe, illusory, and largely, if not entirely, nullified by the proviso in the second part of the clause. Be it remembered that nothing in the first part is to limit or restrict the liability of trustees alluded to in the second part. Let me repeat the exact words of the proviso :

Provided that nothing in this section shall affect the liability of the trustees of such unions to be sued in the events provided for by the Trades Union Act, 1871, section 9.

In other words, under whatever circumstances actions may now be brought against trustees under section 9 of the Act of 1871, they may be brought hereafter if clause 4 passes in its present form. It is necessary, therefore, to see what are the events 'provided for' in that section. Here is the section :

The trustees of any trade union registered under this Act, or any other officer of such trade union who may be authorised so to do by the rules thereof, are hereby empowered to bring or defend, or cause to be brought or defended, any action, suit, prosecution or complaint in any court of law and equity touching or concerning the property, right or claim to property of the trade union, and shall and may, in all cases concerning the real or personal property of such trade union, sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, in any court of law or equity, in their proper names, without other description than the title of their office; and no such action, suit, prosecution or complaint shall be discontinued or shall abate by the death or removal from office of such persons or any of them, but the same shall and may be proceeded in by their successor or successors as if such death, resignation or removal had not taken place, and

such successors shall pay or receive the like costs as if the action, suit, or prosecution or complaint had been commenced in their names for the benefit of or to be reimbursed from the funds of such trade union, and the summons to be issued to each trustee or other officer may be served by leaving the same at the registered office of the trade union.

I have italicised the vital words in this section. It will thus be seen that the trustees are empowered 'to defend . . . any action . . . touching or concerning the property, right or claim to property of the trade union.' Do these words cover an action in which a claim is made for damages for tort? If they do, then it is perfectly clear that the actions which are prohibited against trade unions *per se* by the first part of clause 4 are maintainable against the trustees by reason of the proviso contained in the second part of the clause. The very point has been decided in the affirmative by high judicial authority—by Sir James Mathew, late Lord Justice of Appeal. It was in the case of *Linaker v. Pilcher*, in 1901. The action was one of libel, against the Trustees of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants as owners of the *Railway Review*, in which the libel appeared.

It was argued on behalf of the plaintiffs in the case (which is reported in *Law Journal Reports*, vol. 70, p. 396, and the *Times Law Reports*, vol. 17, p. 256), that they were entitled to attach the funds of the union under section 9 of the Act of 1871.

For the defendants it was contended by Mr. Rufus Isaacs that 'the funds of the society could not be made liable for the tort of the trustees. . . . The persons actually committing the tort are solely liable for it. The number of the members of the society are not liable, but only those actually responsible for the tort. This is not an action touching or concerning the property of the society within section 9 of the Trades Union Act, 1871.' Mr. Justice Mathew, in delivering judgment, said, as reported in the *Law Journal* :

In my opinion 'property' in section 9 of the Act of 1871 means property generally; and an action to add to the assets of the society—for example, an action brought for breach of contract entered into on behalf of the society—would be an action 'touching or concerning the property . . . of the trade union.' So an action which threatened the assets of the society by a claim for damages, as in this case, would be an action that touched and concerned the property of the society.

And according to the *Times Law Reports* he declared expressly :
' . . . likewise an action for damages for tort would be an action touching the property "of the society." '

And he gave judgment against the trustees, with a declaration that they were to be indemnified out of the funds of the society.

In commenting on this case Mr. D. R. Chalmers Hunt, the author of *The Law Relating to Trade Unions*, said :

It was argued on behalf of the trade union that the section (9) only referred to actions by or against trustees in which the title to property was being

asserted or defended, but Matthew, J., held that *the section embraced all actions which in any way affected the property of the trade union directly or indirectly*. The importance of the decision in *Linaker v. Pileher* is not in any way diminished by the equally recent case of *Taff Vale*. . . .

The same learned gentleman, in a further comment (in the *Times*, April 14, 1906), says :

Sir James Mathew . . . held without the least hesitation that sections 8 and 9 included and authorised an action for damages in tort (in this case a libel) brought against a registered trade union and its trustees.

There can, therefore, it seems, be little doubt that with the law as interpreted by Mr. Justice Mathew the proviso to clause 4 takes away with one hand what the first part of the clause concedes with the other. In a nutshell, the first part says, 'You shall not sue the union Tweedledum for the recovery of damages,' but the second part says, 'You can, however, sue the trustees Tweedledee.' And having sued the trustees successfully, you can have an action, if necessary, for a declaration of indemnity against the funds of the union, which the clause does not in the least prohibit. If the proviso is not intended to have this effect, why is it put in? Section 9 of the Act of 1871 would still be good law, and any judicial interpretations of it inconsistent with the first part of clause 4 would still be abrogated by that clause.

To give full and unequivocal effect to the Government pledges the clause should read as follows :

An action against a trade union or any branch thereof, whether of workmen or masters, or against any members thereof, on behalf of themselves and all or any other members of the trade union, in respect of any tortious act alleged to have been committed by or on behalf of the trade union, shall not be entertained by any court.

I moved amendments on the Committee stage to make the clause so read. They were not accepted. The Attorney-General promised to consider them before the report stage. That is where the matter stands.

May I recall a certain passage in the history of Liberalism and organised Labour? In 1867 the Conservative party enfranchised the town workers. The General Election came the following year. Many wise political prophets anticipated that the industrial towns would 'go' Conservative. They did nothing of the kind. They went almost solidly Liberal. Why? The Liberals promised to legalise the Unions and to bring the criminal law of strikes into accordance with the general criminal law of the land. Upon the strength of that promise all the leaders of Labour worked like Trojans for the Liberal party. The Government attempted to redeem their pledge to Labour in 1871. That pledge was redeemed satisfactorily except in one important particular. Home Secretary Bruce introduced the famous clause 3 in the Criminal Amendment Bill. The friends of

Labour contended that that clause made their position worse. Mr. Bruce said it did nothing of the kind, and obstinately insisted upon retaining it in spite of the request of Labour leaders and their friends, and in spite of the advice of some of his colleagues. Within a few months the courts confirmed the views of the Labour leaders and their friends. The Government declined to pass a Bill abolishing the clause. Labour organised against the Government. They ran an Independent Labour candidate against Liberal and Conservative at a by-election at Greenwich in 1873, and thereby put the Conservative in. They gloried in the fact. In 1874 the unions went further and organised an Independent Labour party, running thirteen candidates against the Liberals; and almost everywhere, though many of them were keen Radicals, they worked against the Liberals. What happened is history. Say Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb significantly in their *History of Trade Unionism* :

It will be a question for the historian of English politics whether the unexpected rout of the Liberal party at the election of 1874 was not due more to the active hostility of trade unionists than to the sullen abstention of the Nonconformists.

The Conservatives repealed the clause in 1875. Do I need to point the moral? To-day there is a great Labour party in the House. They believe that Taff Vale and the attitude of the late Government towards that decision are chiefly responsible for their being there in such force. Most of them are Radicals and supremely desire a water-tight Act preserving the Unions from further destructive litigation. A few there be who hate Liberalism and care but little for trade unionism. They would rather see the Liberals pass a measure which the courts shall show hereafter still leaves unions open to attack. It would serve to increase their party at the next election with the war-cry 'The Liberals have betrayed the Unions!' I hope the Attorney-General appreciates the political significance of the alternatives.

CLEMENT EDWARDS.

THE ISLAND OF 'OOF'

Like a dream our prime is flown,
 Prisoned in a study :
 Sport and folly are youth's own,
 Tender youth and ruddy.

THE lilting refrain of the old Latin *Student's Song*, Englished by a modern poet, ran strangely in his head, chiming with his mood though far from expressing his condition. Certainly his own prime was not flown, nor could his life as an undergraduate be called studious imprisonment, although his share in the traditional follies of his university was considerably smaller than that of some of his friends. And the rest went wide of the mark ; youth is no longer tender, seldom ruddy. He was merely a clean-shaved, well-featured, rather pale young man, somewhat resembling the picture of Cardinal Newman when *in statu pupillari*, but without the least trace of his future asceticism.

Before him on the table lay a heap of severely entitled books, written notes, and other evidences of intellectual purpose, just now not invitingly. He dipped his pen, but gave another glance at the poem. Its opening words were powerfully seductive at the present seasonal instant :

Cast aside dull books and thought :
 Sweet is folly, sweet is play !
 Take the pleasure spring hath brought
 In life's opening holiday.
 Meet it is that age should ponder
 O'er grave matters fraught with care :
 Tender youth is free to wander,
 Free to frolic, light as air.

There it was again, tender youth ; that clearly meant himself, while pondering age was obviously the dons, and grave matters fraught with care stood for the Law Tripos. He could not resist the charm of the pulsing music and its alluring solicitation ; it seemed to possess the force of a mystic command, a spiritual exhortation not to wrong the season's sanctities by immuring himself longer in college rooms. Looking from the window he beheld the fresh sunlit lawn, delicately powdered with a film of white daisies, and crossed by thin morning

shadows, with the pinnacles of his college chapel far-stretched on its surface. He revolved the inevitable moralities: was it right that he should abandon his labours for that sunny, sky-covered outer world? A number of small birds, tripping daintily over close-shaven sward in pursuit of belated worms, proved the deciding scruple in the scale. *What if they had remained indoors?* 'I too, if I go out, may find my worm,' he said thoughtfully.

In mere absence of mind he put on his cap and gown, forgetting that the early hour did not call for academicals. Then, closing the door, he stepped noiselessly down the old crooked oak staircase, wondering a little that the unusual act did not appeal to his sense of the ludicrous. He was, however, in a dreamy mood; the result, perhaps, of overwork, though more probably of illicit reading in subjects other than the prescribed agenda of law. But this could hardly account for the remarkable change in his surroundings as he neared the bottom of the descent. Dark as it was, Staircase D had not hitherto afforded optical illusions, yet it did so now beyond question. On emerging from his room he had seen the familiar legend, 'J. Boggs,' in white letters over the opposite door; the next landing, though less distinctly, had shown him the sported oaks of two second-year men; but in the dusky lower flight the miraculous happened. Here he was astonished to see a shabby figure in knee-breeches and greasy jacket, carrying a silver dish of antique pattern into a room on the ground floor. The room, as he knew well, was inhabited by his friend Broadhurst, the stroke of his college boat; in its normal state it was adorned with pewter prize-mugs, oars, and photographs of music-hall artists; but now, glancing through the door, he perceived an antique apartment, seemingly of the age of Queen Elizabeth. The walls were hung with quaintly pictured tapestry, the windows filled with lumps of opaque glass set in lead; the floor was rush-strewn, and two small bookshelves held a number of black-letter volumes, apparently purloined from the collection of original imprints of the sixteenth century in the college library. On a low black-oak chair lay a pair of richly embroidered gloves, with a musical instrument of the lute order. The table, also of black oak, was laid for a meal, with what appeared to be silver dishes, and with knives and spoons but no forks. A handsome crest, it seemed of some ancient family, hung over the mantelpiece.

Greatly perplexed by this mysterious freak of his friend—whom he had supposed as incapable of experiments in antique decoration as of black-letter research—he entered the room and took down one of the books; it was entitled *Questiones Besae Theologicae*. He had just remarked the surprising freshness of the print when a loud and strange voice behind him cried out:

'Sirrah! What dost thou in my maister's chamber?'

Turning in some alarm, and nearly dropping the folio in his

nervousness, he beheld the greasy serving-man he had seen on the stairs advancing towards him from the inner room, a large meat-knife in his hand and his face wearing a look of ferocious truculence.

'Oh, it's all right, it's a mistake, you know,' he explained, hastily returning the volume. But as he did so the visage of the man-servant underwent a sudden change; he stared for a moment with his mouth open, and then bowed almost to the rush-covered floor. 'My lord will be 'ere anon,' he said in a humble and somewhat frightened tone, 'au' if your honour (or your worship) is to dine with 'im I will presently make another place. But 'e 'at's given me no commandment therein.'

Escape would doubtless have been a wise exchange for valour; but the undergraduate was consumed by two things—insatiable curiosity, and now, though it could not be more than half-past ten, a gnawing sense of hunger, born no doubt of an insufficient breakfast. These twin impulses urged him to see the adventure to its close regardless of consequences; but before he could speak another remarkable figure entered the room.

This was a young man of about his own age, and, like himself, enveloped in a scholastic gown; under which, however, he could see a rich doublet of silk trunk hose, and delicately coloured stockings terminating in pointed shoes with rosettes. He wore, also, a fine white ruff and a sword, the latter with some difficulty concealed. His complexion was clear and fresh, his teeth milk-white, his hair light and curling, and his eyes of an agreeable blue; a downy moustache and beard completing the picture of a charming youth, albeit oddly attired and plainly of another age. His expression was gentle and somewhat dreamy, yet tending to mirth.

'Fore God, I have 'scaped the Provost but by an inch,' he said with a merry grimace as he came in; then, finding himself confronted by the black-gowned undergraduate, gazing at him through gold-rimmed spectacles, his exultation turned to dismay with comic rapidity. It was clear that he took his visitor for some species of mediæval don, clothed with punitive functions.

'Sir, I crave your pardon,' he began, making an obeisance nearly as profound as his servant's; but observing the youthfulness of his supposed enemy he burst into a laugh.

'Od's bodikins! I feared you were a Doctor at least, if not the Vice-Chancellor himself,' he explained with a peculiar grace of manner, motioning his servant to offer him one of the only two chairs in the room. 'Now, however, I perceive that you are a student of some other university; of Oxford, perhaps (for I know not what fashioned gowns they wear), or perchance of Paris. Marry, we are well met; and you shall dine with me, for Maggot hath provided more than enough for two, that he might have a greater reversion for himself.'

'Thanks, thanks awfully—er—I mean I should like it very much,' the young man stammered. On the face of it the thing had the

appearance of an elaborate hoax ; but he felt half-famished, and the dinner, or luncheon, looked tempting.

With the utmost politeness his host helped him to remove his gown, the servant performing the same office for himself. Then, after a short Latin grace, unctuously pronounced yet not without a suspicion of waggishness, they sat down to the feast. It consisted of roast beef, mutton, fish, eels, and a capon, with sundry greens, but no potatoes, and what his host called 'wine of the Canaries.'

'I am but lately recovered of a tertian,' he explained ; 'else I should dine in common hall, served by little dirty-pawed sizars in gowns, that spill the meats and drink. And if it were not for my estate I could not have even these two poor chambers to myself, but would sleep pigged in three or four in bed, like salted fish.'

Complexity best expresses the undergraduate's feelings during the meal. The attentions of his courtly host, the strange yet agreeable flavour of the foods, and the awkwardness of eating without a fork, together with the necessity of erasing three hundred years of his historical memory, rendered the repast at once the most delightful and difficult of his life. He resolved to conceal his chronological identity, and to allow his entertainer to suppose him a member of some contemporary seat of learning, travelling for pleasure or information. This was easier than might be thought, his use of strictly modern English being regarded by the Elizabethan as the imperfect efforts of a comparative stranger to the tongue. The attempt, however, to express shrewd opinions on the political policies of the Earl of Essex, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Cecil ; to offer ingenious speculations as to the probable successor of the Virgin Queen ; and to swell with pious gratulation for the defeat of the Spanish Armada, taxed his powers to the utmost. Another strain was imposed by his companion's use of Italian and colloquial Latin ; another, by the consciousness of the plainness of his own dress as compared with the sumptuous attire of his friend, in which, as upon his fingers, several jewels of price sparkled exquisitely. He was relieved, however, to find that he was not a lord.

'Maggot here calleth me so,' he explained ; 'but in truth I am no more than Francis Aubrey, a lord's younger son, with but a scanty fortune. Wherefore I must either mate with riches or else seek service at Court ; though it jumps best with my inclination to essay these new Virginias, whereof our Raleigh makes such brave report, and where, 'tis said, honour may be got, with a great store of gold. And now, gentle Sir, sith I have been thus free with you, may I demand your country and university, that we be strangers no longer ?'

The undergraduate had foreseen the question, and now flattered himself on the ingenuity of his reply. 'It's an Empire,' he answered boldly, 'with its headquarters on one of the *Cassiterides* or Isles of Tin ; some people call it the "Isle of Oof." That means money, you know, Consols, and four per cents., and all that. It's also famous for fighting

in all sorts of places abroad, and for colonial expansion, and intelligence, and education, and inventions. My knowledge-shop is called the *Universitas Poetarum*, because most of our poets, when we had any, went there,—Milton, you know, and Wordsworth, and Byron, and Tennyson. But poetry doesn't pay now, so we've shunted it for science, "labs" and that sort of thing.' A feeling that he had been culpably flippant was balanced by self-approval for his cunning in the avoidance of poetical names prior or contemporary to the Elizabethan, whose memory, he was almost startled to observe, was a complete blank as to the future.

His host, for the first time, showed a touch of pride, national and personal. 'This Albion of ours hath also her rich estates, now that we have despoiled the papist monks of their slothful heritage,' he said with a slight appearance of hauteur. 'And she has had her conquests—in the fields of France, and in Holy Land, as well as on the seas 'gainst the Spaniard. Moreover, her exemplars of the Muse fall not below the greatest of the ancients in noble invention and lofty conceits; the gentle Spenser, learned Ben Jonson, and mighty Marlowe (these were bred here in our *Cantabrigia*); with this new plant and flower of poesy, Will Shakespeare, that I have seen both in tragedy and comedy, and do esteem the most godlike of men for sublime conception and ease in setting forth. And we have also many lesser swans, among whom my longing is (like our Earl of Oxford, my kinsman) to inscribe my name, for I value the laureate's wreath better than a king's crown. But come, we have eaten and drunk; let's now have some music, for thus friendship is augmented.'

The courtier-student, whose manner had undergone a perceptible increase of dignity, pressed several musical instruments upon his guest, who at length chose one having some affinity to a modern banjo, though he refused to be the first performer. 'I'd rather you started the ball,' he said modestly.

His host bowed. 'I will discourse to you some of our late-made songs, newly fitted to music by choice composers,' he said. 'Then, if you will cap them with some of your own country, it will be a pleasant employment to see wherein one or the other may excel.'

He began at once, in a clear and pleasing voice, accompanied by his lute, the *Hamadryad's Song* of Thomas Lodge :

Pluck the fruit and taste the pleasure,
 Youthful Lordlings, of delight !
 While occasion gives you seizure,
 Feed your fancies and your sight !
 After death, when you are gone,
 Joy and pleasure there is none.
 Now the pleasant spring allureth,
 And both place and time invite.
 Out ! Alas ! What heart endureth
 To disclaim his sweet delight ?
 After death, when we are gone,
 Joy and pleasure there is none.

The fine pagan lyric went to a swinging tune that suited it well. Then, on the listener's urgency, another followed, sung to a softer air and with a shade of embarrassment on the performer's part :

Love guards the roses of thy lips,
And flies about them like a bee :
If I approach he forward skips,
And if I kiss he stingeth me.

Yet others followed, all redolent of their age, of life, love, and beauty, of spring-time and youth, of change and decay ; but so obviously thrown at the head of the Edwardian as a boastful challenge to the performers of his own country that his heart sank within him. Not for worlds would he have accepted the adventure could he have foreseen this ordeal. He racked his brain for pieces at once typical of his time and within the compass of his vocal and instrumental attainments ; but nothing loftier than music-hall and kindred harmonies came to his distraught memory. In the end, and after hastily weighing the merits of *The Man that Broke the Bank at Monte Carlo* against the *Old Kent Road*, and finding both beyond his powers, he burst forth in sheer desperation with the last topical ballad he had rendered to a strictly private audience at his home in East Putney, and of which the following was the refrain :

You can tell his blooming dollars
By the edges of his collars,
For it all comes out in the wash, wash, wash !

Then, overcome with shame for the bathos to which he had descended, dragging with him the fame of his vaunted isle, he laid aside the banjo and fumbled apologies with a smarting face. But the Elizabethan laughed.

'I' faith, a merry matter, and excellent well sung,' he said with gay approval ; 'though methinks for him that understands not the idiom it needs a gloss as much as the language of the Scots. Nevertheless, it has infected me with a longing to know more of your Island of Oof, which must indeed be rich to afford such dainty confections. Pray tell me if it be far hence, for I am soon to travel, and should love to see its wonders.'

'It's about three hundred years—miles I mean,' the young man answered, feeling hot and uncomfortable. 'And it's awfully hard to find.'

His companion laughed again. 'I doubt not, that our Drake and Raleigh know it well, but have cunningly concealed the longitude,' he said. 'Now, however, I would fain know something of your dramatical works ; for so brave a country cannot lack playhouses, like those of our London, with many nimble wits to serve them.'

The undergraduate brightened. He was really a studious young man, as already intimated ; but his labours in the rudiments of law

had been considerably eased by visits to the more popular places of entertainment in the metropolis, and he believed that his knowledge of the national drama, if not deep, was at least wide. 'Oh, yes; we have no end of theatres, not to speak of music-halls,' he replied with enthusiasm; 'some of them really gorgeous. You ought to see the decorations, classical, Renaissance, and Moorish. And some of the scenery is stunning.'

'No doubt they are of inlaid ivory, with hangings of cloth of gold,' his host assented with polite incredulity. 'And doubtless your Lord Chamberlain hath much ado to license plays fitted to such brave adornment?'

'Oh, our Chamberlain's a bit of an actor himself, and knows exactly what will go down,' the undergraduate answered with a feeble attempt at wit. It was not his real opinion of the statesman in question; but he was annoyed at the Elizabethan's superior airs. 'The fact is, though,' he went on, 'some of our modern plays are ripping; psychological, you know, and sometimes a little *risqué*, but always up to date. They beat those by the old duffers all to nothing, except, of course, Shakes—'

He checked himself in time; for the subject seemed to act on the mind of his host as a strong irritant. The young courtier's lip curled disdainfully; his blue eyes flashed; and his hand crept to the hilt of his sword, which he had again put on. 'Marry!' he exclaimed with passion; 'the plays of this country, in tragedy, comedy, history, and pastoral, and even in masques and such-like shows, go before all other in the world; and to name the writers thereof, from our Sackville to the stately swans that now swim in our waters, were an iteration of the chiefest wits of time. And if your playhouses be more costly than ours of the Rose, the Swan, and the Globe, they have not sounded to sweet Shakespeare's heroical and ravishing strains, or —'

'Oh, yes, they have; I've seen Irving, in *Hamlet*, lots of times,' the undergraduate interrupted recklessly; but the other went on, now in a tone of light banter.

'I travel presently with my tutor into Italy,' he said, 'for perfecting myself in the speech and vices of that land; and if this marvellous Hesperides of thine lieth near to her coasts, I prithee give me the names of some of those pieces you have commended, for I will assuredly see and hear them.'

The young man, dreading a return of his host's anger, and a possible recourse to his weapon, tortured his brain for dramatic titles in support of his praise; while the inquirer, with an air of mock gravity, wrote down in the unhampered spelling of his time: *Ye Third Mistresse Potiphare*, *Charlaye his Aunte*, *Oure Flatte*, and *What Happained to Snookes*. Then, with another of the swift changes common to men of his age, he said politely: 'Come, let us forth of this chamber; it smells of leeks, and must be sweetened anon with lavender. I would

have you see our poor Garden of the Muses, that you may compare it with your *Universitas Poetarum*, in the outward show and fashion thereof.'

Once more gowned, the Elizabethan's gay plumage only half-hidden as before, they sallied out; the servant, Maggot, having pronounced the ways clear. 'I' faith,' said the courtier-student, with a shamefaced laugh, 'since the new Statutes were framed for our governance we must all live by' book. And if one stir abroad in anything less black than a crow, or with his hair grown longer than an inch, our Provost will have a mind to clap him in the stocks!'

Words cannot express the undergraduate's sensations as they wandered together through the streets and by-ways of the town, a world at once unknown and familiar. Many of the colleges looked glaringly new, and all were shorn of their modern additions. Everywhere, projecting gables, decorated fronts, small-paned windows, and pictorial swinging signs, told of a homely universal art long since dead; while a fleet of high-pooped sailing craft in the river reminded him that the 'Fens were still undrained, and his *alma mater* a seaport. More than all else the throngs of strange people, of bygone dress, manners, speech, and even features, charmed his imagination; he noted the portentous march of occasional robed ecclesiastics through the busy crowds of townsmen, the groups of tender-aged scholars going with their long-gowned tutors to the schools, the housewives in ruff and farthingale buying in the market, the clearer complexions, brighter colour, and more vigorous action of a younger race. His guide, after pointing out what he regarded as the principal sights, conveyed him, somewhat furtively, to the taverns, where a good many youths were singing and drinking, and thence after further refreshment to the bear-garden, the bull-ring and cock-pit, and the archery butts, the last-named already falling into disuse. Next, desirous to furnish him with proofs of his country's material resources, he carried him off to the noisy booths and shows of Stourbridge Fair.

As they returned across the public commons the afternoon sun, piercing a crimson cloud, fell full on the spires, towers, and clustered roofs before them. 'A rose-red city, half as old as time,' it looked for the moment. Here also, as in his own world, the undergraduate saw that it was spring; the birds were singing, the meads were aflame with white and gold, the orchards full of bloom, the gardens gay with flowers, the cool air laden with perfumes. Over all hung the limpid sky of the younger England's May, fresher and purer it seemed than any he had ever known.

The Elizabethan was visibly affected, and heaved a lover's sigh. 'Hath your Island of Oof such pleasaunce as this in the springtime?' he asked sentimentally.

'Yes, when our weather clerk isn't in bad humour,' the undergraduate answered, again with facetious intent.

'And doth your *Universitas Poetarum* look with so fair a face on the sun?' He spoke with dreamy indolence and half-closed eyes.

'It's—er—larger,' his companion replied, having in mind the ravages of Victorian architecture.

But it was plain that the soft season was not uppermost in the mind of the Elizabethan, for he changed the subject abruptly. 'And is this oof,' he inquired curiously, 'that you say standeth in your language for silver and gold, so plentiful in your country that a gentleman may soon enrich himself, perhaps by war or such like gallant venture?'

'Well, company promoting pays better just now, or at least it did,' said his instructor cautiously.

'That is all one,' said the other; 'for I doubt not it means to shark up a band of purseless fellows for some business of hazardous profit; though in sooth I incline to gentler enterprises.'

He stopped suddenly in the midst of the common, and drew from his doublet a folded manuscript, inscribed in Old English text, *Love's Tragedie*, upon which he gazed with fond affection. 'Here I have a tender piece that I lately writ,' he said with confidential enthusiasm, 'setting forth the painful history of a virgin youth and a youthful virgin enthralled in the trammels of love, and of cruel and despiteful fate; a moving conceit once enacted in my own college, and that hath obtained commendation even from the envious wits of the Mermaid Tavern in London. Marry now! if your people of Oof spend such bravery upon their playhouses, they should not fail to reward him that pleaseth them with a new thing, full of heroical action and moral virtue?'

The undergraduate's face fell; clearly he had overshot the mark in his florid description of British theatres. The idea of moral virtue, however heroically presented, extracting money from his contemporaries, struck him with dismay. 'Perhaps it might go down as a music-hall sketch if you put in a few topical gags, something about vivisection or Chinese labour, you know,' he said with a dubious cough.

'It is full of noble and lamentable matter, that must needs move pitifully the hearts of all that see and hear, and arouse them to high Platonical affections,' the amateur went on earnestly. 'For the ancients declare that to behold tragedy softeneth the soul and amendeth the manners; and if it were set forth by fair beardless boys, with delicate voices and smooth gestures, methinks it would please the gentle part of your nation?'

The undergraduate was deeply perplexed. That his contemporaries, at least pending the establishment of a State theatre, would resent any such improving process, he knew too well. 'Couldn't you make it—er—more psychological?' he suggested. 'You might marry her first to some rich old duffer, and then bring on your virgin youth—'

that would be sure to start up some pretty lively situations, and might possibly pull it off.'

His mistake was at once apparent. The Elizabethan's face darkened again, and this time he drew his sword from its scabbard with a sharp flourish. 'Sirrah!' he exclaimed contemptuously. 'If your people of Oof, though their Chamberlain himself be an actor, know not tragedy from comedy, they were best served by the old miracle plays, wherein both were mixed together without discretion. I' faith, I take it that our *Gammer Gurton's Needle* and your *Song of the Wash* are both of the same rude unimpolished stuff, and fit only for children and fools!'

A vivid remembrance of Sir Philip Sidney's threat to stab his tutor, which he would doubtless have carried out had the gentleman been within reach, convinced the undergraduate of his peril; but happily his challenger's attention was diverted by his servant, who now approached across the common with a handsome cloak, which he promptly exchanged for his scholastic robe. An immediate and becoming transformation was the result; to the embarrassment of his companion, whose tattered third-year gown and turned-up trowsers suggested a mediæval tramp—he had, in fact, seen little 'prentice boys in trim knee-breeches grinning at what they called his 'outlandish hosen.' Altogether, the champion of the Edwardian age felt profoundly dissatisfied with himself and his epoch. Throughout their walk he had discoursed of modern inventions, the motor-car, gramophone, and wireless telegraph; but his friend had merely listened with the tolerance of a man of the world, accustomed to the licensed mendacities of tourists. It was disgustingly plain that this Italianate Englishman, who read Petrarch and Ariosto, and talked Latin with the blundering fluency of a schoolman, held himself in every way his superior; and—this was the humiliating part—not wholly without reason. But what chiefly angered him was his own failure to uphold the honour of his age against its spacious and infinitely more picturesque predecessor. He might have made a better selection of lyrical and dramatic examples, or dwelt with more insistence on the triumphs of scientific research, evolution, sanitation, and the Nebular Hypothesis. He should have emphasised the expansion of the race, the modern halfpenny paper, and the novel—the novel especially. He might have quoted from the more serious modern poets, had he known anything about them; but, after all, his haphazard instances might more truly have reflected his nascent century, and the thought was chilling.

They stopped again, on the outskirts of the town, while his conductor adjusted his dress with finical care. 'I pay my duty to a gentlewoman who dwells at my Lord Marchbank's house near by,' he said, flushing slightly, 'a nymph as fair as Sidney's Stella, and with a fortune almost correspondent to my desires. Lord! I would like

better to adventure these new Americas, only my father, being at great charge, will have me marry quickly. But on the morrow I ride to London ; and as I have two good nags, I should be glad of your company thither, that, before returning to your Island, you may see our Shakespeare in his tender and moving tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet*.'

A mist came over the undergraduate's eyes, and then cleared away. He saw from his window the familiar lawn and the cool morning shadows ; also—what he had never noticed before—the blank wall of a new warehouse, inscribed in angular characters with the legend : 'Higgins and Scroggs, the China Bazaar.' In the street below the usual rickety male population in bowler hats and bag-kneed trousers went to and fro. A sense of loss, of dulness, of prosaic monotony, came over him ; the present was without colour, the future a grey plain. Never again would Englishmen break out into madrigals from sheer exuberance of joy and animal spirits ; they were now trying in laboratories, by vivisection and other means, to discover why they ever did so at all, and how brain secretes the soul of man in its higher attributes. The refrain of the Latin *Student's Song* ran painfully in his head :

Like a dream our prime is flown,
Prisoned in a study :
Sport and folly are youth's own,
Tender youth and ruddy.

It seemed to express the history of his race ; here in its very prime, from zeal of scientific achievement, the life-blood had left its cheeks, and it had become flaccid, anæmic, neurotic. But the whole thing was a dream, if not a practical joke of his friend Broadhurst, whose 'ragging' propensities were notorious. He looked again at the China Bazaar. Three hundred years ago its proprietors would have been content to denote themselves and their business by the modest sign of *The Blue Flower Pot* ; now, defiantly and discordantly to all the world, they were Higgins and Scroggs ! The co-partnership thus announced seemed to stamp his opening century as with a hall-mark or seal.

A. G. HYDE.

Cambridge.

AMERICAN SPELLING

A REVOLUTION in spelling is surely one of those revolutions which can only find justification in the prospect of a complete and speedy success. If there were reasonable ground for believing that within a period of ten years or so English speakers on both sides of the Atlantic would adopt one uniform system of phonetic orthography, such action as that recently attributed to the President of the United States might deserve our warmest gratitude. But without fair hope that the new scheme will enlist the sympathies of the great majority, to disturb the existing order of things is only to intensify the mischief which calls for remedy. The more resolute the effort, the more protracted the experiment, the larger the number who are influenced, the more the cause of learning is bound to suffer. No one can contemplate without alarm the orthographical anarchy which must inevitably result, not to speak of the irritation and waste of time which such controversies usually bring in their train.

On the other hand there seems little immediate prospect, at any rate in this country, of overcoming that placid *vis inertiae* which stands in the way of organised spelling reform. The tone of most of the recent newspaper comments upon President Roosevelt's proposals have made this abundantly clear. Moreover, there are other considerations of which the newspapers have not spoken, but which must exercise considerable weight in the long run. Sentiment in this matter counts for something, and, however desirable uniformity might appear in itself, there would always be a prejudice in England against following a purely American initiative. Our courteous Transatlantic kinsmen would, I believe, be the first to appreciate the difficulty if they recalled the circumstances under which the already existing divergence of usage between the two countries has taken shape. To try to explain these circumstances in an intelligible form is the main object of the few pages which follow.

If we may for convenience' sake use the term 'American spelling' to denote the sum of those departures from British usage (e.g. *favor* instead of *favour*, *center* for *centre*, *traveler* for *traveller*, and the like), which we are accustomed to associate with books printed in the United States, the question at once suggests itself: How did this

distinctively American spelling originate? Is it, as may well be the case with certain peculiarities of diction and pronunciation, an inheritance bequeathed by the early settlers in New England and treasured by their descendants as a venerable tradition, or is it an artificial product consciously devised in order to serve a purpose? The answer cannot be doubtful for anyone who will take the trouble to look into the facts. Previously to the Declaration of Independence there was no distinction between the spelling of books printed in the American colonies and those of the mother country. It would be useless to establish the point by an array of evidence, but evidence in abundance is ready to hand. Such spellings as *labor*, *honor*, &c. were not indeed unknown in the United States before 1782, just as they were not unknown in England; but the more ordinary form was *labour*, *honour*. A single illustration will suffice.

One of the first advocates of phonetic spelling on the further side of the Atlantic was Dr. Benjamin Franklin, scientist and philosopher. Franklin's views in this matter were revolutionary, but whatever he may have held in theory, he adopted in practice the spelling of those around him. This great American, as everyone knows, had begun life as a printer at Philadelphia, and the books which came from his press may still be consulted. Taking one of these volumes which contains certain letters of George Whitefield, and which bears on its title-page the imprint of 'Benjamin Franklin; in the Printing Office, near the Market, Philadelphia, 1740,' I find uniformly such spellings as *favourite* (p. 3), *honour'd* (p. 2), *labour* (p. 13), even *prophane* (p. 14), and *fullness* (p. 15), &c. The point, however, is one which leaves no room for difference of opinion.¹ It will not be disputed that American spelling belongs to a much later date, and that it was the creation of the great lexicographer, Noah Webster.

Webster, born in 1758, had taken to schoolmastering after the War of Independence, and in 1785 brought out some school books under the rather pretentious title of *Grammatical Institutes of the English Language*. But his interest in philological questions was genuine enough, and in 1789 he published a volume of *Dissertations*, the substance of which had previously been delivered orally as lectures while he was travelling up and down the different States to secure copyright privileges for his school books. Webster's volume of *Dissertations* is especially interesting, because at the outset of his career it contains in the frankest terms a statement of his views and aspirations regarding the 'American language.' A few

¹ In the preface to the early editions of Webster's own Spelling-book we find *favour*, *labour*, &c. For instance, in the fourth edition (Boston, 1792) we read: 'The spelling of such words as *publick*, *neighbour*, &c. has the plea of antiquity in its favour' (sic). In the text we have *neighbor*, *labor*, *favor*, *humor*, but *clamour* (p. 58), *rigour* (p. 59), *parlour* (p. 60), and *langour* (sic). All these words are printed in large type for the children to learn. Even if these be printer's errors, they bear witness to earlier American usage.

quotations in his own words will serve better than anything else to make his attitude clear.

As an independent nation [he declares], our honor requires us to have a system of our own, in language as well as in government. Great Britain, whose children we are and whose language we speak, should no longer be *our* standard, for the taste of her writers is already corrupted, and her language is on the decline. ' . . . The English is the common root or stock from which our national language will be derived. All others will gradually waste away—and within a century and a half North America will be peopled with a hundred millions of men all speaking the same language. Let me add [he goes on], that whatever predilection the Americans may have for their native European tongues, and particularly the British descendants for the English, yet several circumstances render a future separation of the American tongue from the English necessary and unavoidable. The vicinity of the European nations, with the uninterrupted communication in peace and the changes of dominion in war, are gradually assimilating their respective languages. The English with others is suffering continual alterations. America, placed at a distance from those nations, will feel in a much less degree the influence of the assimilating causes; at the same time numerous local causes such as a new country, new associations of people, new combinations of ideas in arts and science, and some intercourse with tribes wholly unknown in Europe, will introduce new words into the American tongue. These causes will produce in course of time a language in North America as different from the future language of England as the modern Dutch, Danish, and Swedish are from the German or from one another; like remote branches of a tree springing from the same stock, or rays of light shot from the same center, and diverging from each other in proportion to their distance from the point of separation.

Whether the inhabitants of America can be brought to a perfect uniformity in the pronunciation of words, it is not easy to predict, but it is certain that no attempt of the kind has been made, and an experiment, begun and pursued on the right principles, is the only way to decide the question. Schools in Great Britain have gone far towards demolishing local dialects—Commerce has also had its influence—and in America these causes operating more generally must have a proportionate effect.²

In his anticipation of a division of tongues Webster's prognostics have been singularly at fault. Even had the means of communication remained as they were in the eighteenth century we may much doubt if two literary languages after the invention of printing could so easily drift apart; but Webster in any case could not possibly foresee the revolutions effected by steam and the electric telegraph. He accordingly urged the necessity of deliberately erecting a barrier to shut off literary America from English influences, and in particular to protect what he calls, in the largest of capitals, the 'AMERICAN TONGUE' from the defects and anomalies of English orthography.

Webster then states his proposed reforms, which may be summarised under the following heads:

(1) 'The omission of all superfluous or silent letters.' Thus *bred* should be printed for *bread*, *bilt* for *built*, *ment* for *meant*, &c.

² *Dissertations on the English Language*, Boston 1789, pp. 20–23. It is noteworthy that the book is dedicated to Benjamin Franklin, and contains a reprint of Franklin's letter on phonetic spelling.

(2) 'The substitution of a character that has a certain definite sound for one that is more vague and indeterminate.' Thus *ee* should be substituted for *ea* (e.g. *speak* for *speea*), or for *ie* (e.g. *meen* for *mien*), while we should write *dauter* for *daughter*, *tuf* for *tough*, *plow* for *plough*, *blud* for *blood*, *korus* for *chorus*, *masheen* for *machine*, &c.

(3) By some slight typographical modifications, e.g. 'the addition of a point,' it would be possible to distinguish different sounds without the introduction of a new character; e.g. to distinguish the two sounds of *th*, or the various values of the vowel *a*.

After explaining these proposals the writer continues:

But a capital advantage of this reform in these States would be that it would make a difference between the English orthography and the American. This will startle those who have not attended to the subject, but I am confident that such an event is of vast political consequence.

He proceeds to give his reasons at some length, and the first is stated in the following terms:

The alteration, however small, would encourage the publication of books in our own country. It would render it in some measure necessary that all books should be printed in America. The English would never copy our orthography for their own use, and consequently the same impressions of books would not answer for both countries. The present generation of inhabitants would read the English impression, but posterity, being taught a different spelling, would prefer the American orthography.

Vast as were Webster's conceptions, he seems even at this early stage to have had a presentiment that any modification of current usage in the direction of phonetic spelling would have to be on a very limited scale. His words 'this alteration *however small*' certainly imply that at the very outset he despaired of any change which was thorough and systematic. But he continues:

Besides this a *national language* is a bond of *national union*. Every engine should be employed to render the people of this country *national*, to call their attachments home to their own country, and to inspire them with the pride of national character. However they may boast of independence and the freedom of their government, yet their *opinions* are not sufficiently independent. An astonishing respect for the arts and literature of their parent country and a blind imitation of its *manners* are still prevalent among the Americans.³

There is much more to the same effect. I will only quote one final sentence:

America is in a situation the most favorable for great reformatations, and the present time is in a singular degree auspicious. . . . Now is the time, and this the country, in which we may expect success.

No one will now think any the worse of Noah Webster for his patriotism, but it is evident that opposition to England had much, if not everything, to say to his attitude in the matter of spelling reform. The modifications which he at first contemplated were of

³ *Op. cit.* pp. 394-406. Italics in original.

a comprehensive character, and in spite of a good many inconsistencies did not fall very far short of a complete phonetic system. The year after the appearance of the *Dissertations*, i.e., in 1790, Webster published a volume of *Essays*, and of this book the last hundred pages or more were set up in the spelling which he recommended for general adoption.⁴ In the preface, which also exhibits the same peculiar orthography, he explains why his experiment had not been extended to the whole work. The passage may be quoted *literatim* as a specimen of the reforms which he had then in contemplation.

The reeder wil obzerv that the orthography of the volum iz not uniform. The reezon iz, that many of the essays hav been published before in the common orthography, and it would have been a laborious task to eopy the whole, for the sake of changing the spelling. In the essays ritten within the last year, a considerable change of spelling iz introduced by way of experiment. This liberty waz taken by the riters before the age of queen Elizabeth, and to this we are indeted for the preference of modern spelling over that of Gower and Chaucer. The man who admits that the change of *housbonde*, *mynde*, *ygone*, *moneth*, into *husband*, *mind*, *gone*, *month*, iz an improovment, must acknowledge also the rking of *helth*, *breth*, *rong*, *tung*, *munth*, to be an improovment. There is no alternativ. Every possible reezon that could ever be offered for altering the spelling of wurds, stil exists in full force; and if a gradual reform should not be made in our language, it wil proov that we are less under the influence of reezon than our ancestors.

Hartford, June, 1790.⁵

It would not serve any useful purpose to point out the deficiencies and inconsistencies of this system, which was obviously conceived in a practical spirit of compromise. The only point of importance is that the experiment was not received with such favour as to lead to any further efforts of the same radical character. Neither in his Spelling-book nor in his Dictionary did Webster seriously attempt to enforce the principles stated above. He still clung to the idea of a separate American language breaking off from the parent stock, and he still insisted upon a distinctive spelling as a means of arriving at that result; but the slender minimum of difference for which he held out suggests that he was influenced, not so much by attachment to a scientific system, as by the determination to maintain a distinction from England for mere distinction's sake.

While the preface to the Dictionary of 1841, the last edition which was printed in the author's lifetime, plainly shows that Webster never ceased to regard the phonetic system as desirable in itself, the text of the book, on the other hand, makes it equally clear that in a number of instances in which he had previously attempted innovations he found himself compelled to beat a retreat. Webster, as I

⁴ The diacritical marks to distinguish the varying sounds of *th* &c., as suggested in heading 3 above, are not employed. No doubt he found that the experiment would have been too costly in this form.

⁵ *A Collection of Essays and Fugitiv Writings on Moral, Historical, Political, and Literary Subjects*, by Noah Webster, Boston, 1790, pp. x-xi.

have just said, had always advanced very cautiously. In his Spelling-books particularly he had never tried to make any startling break with existing usage. His efforts had been confined to the *honor* and *scepter* classes of words and to a few pet hobbies, mostly introduced to feel the way and presented in the guise of admissible alternatives. Such hobbies were *bild* for *build*, *thum* for *thumb*, *tung* for *tongue*, *iland* for *island*, &c. But in the Dictionary of 1841 he practically admits his failure. Thus under BILD we read: 'This is the true orthography. The common spelling is incorrect. See BUILD.' Similarly under THUMB he says: 'The common orthography is corrupt. The real word is *thum*.' But the fact remains that at the close of Webster's career, as at the beginning, *build* and *thumb* still represented the 'common orthography,' and the alternatives do not even appear in the later editions of his Dictionary. Consequently when we have mentioned (1) the score of words of the *honor*, *labor* type; (2) the still smaller list of words like *center* and *theater*; and (3) the suppressed double letter in forms like *traveler*, *worshiper*, &c., we have practically got to the end of the points of difference between English and American (*i.e.* Websterian) orthography. No doubt there are other isolated words as to which some variety prevails, but they are not numerous or important. It was well said by one of Webster's critics more than sixty years ago that it hardly seemed worth while for Americans to cut themselves off from English usage for the sake of eighty words in 80,000. Moreover, even with regard to the last two of the three headings just mentioned, the practice of American printers is not uniform. Under the patronage of Worcester's Dictionary *centre* and *traveller* have always had their supporters even in the United States. It is plain then that the net results of Webster's lifelong efforts—he worked with unremitting assiduity until his death in 1842—bear but a small proportion to the programme with which he started.

Still he did succeed in creating a recognised difference between English orthography and that of America, and it is undoubtedly to Webster's personal exertions that the result must be attributed. His Spelling-book was published in 1785, forming the first part of the *Grammatical Institutes*. It went through innumerable editions, and in an Appeal to the Public, printed at New Haven, Connecticut, in 1826, the author stated that 'if we can judge from the numbers sold—not less than seven millions of copies—more than half and probably two thirds of the inhabitants of the United States have received the rudiments of their education from the use of this Spelling-book.' The inconsistencies of the book were many, and they were subjected to much severe criticism by rival philologists,⁶ but the little manual more than held its ground. Curiously enough, it seems that though the

⁶ See, for instance, Cobb, *A Critical Review of the Orthography of Dr. Webster's Series of Books*. New York, 1831.

children had been taught from the beginning to spell *labor*, *honor*, &c., and *scepter*, *ſpelter*, *theater*, &c., it was not until the appearance of *Webster's Revised Spelling Book*, edited by a Mr. Ely in 1829, that we meet the forms *traveler*, *worshiper*, *counselor*, &c., which had been adopted by Webster in his Dictionary of 1828.

It was of course the appearance of these dictionaries containing, as all must admit, some admirable lexicographical work, especially in the matter of definition and arrangement, which lent a certain scientific importance to the whole Websterian system. In a widely distributed advertisement of Webster's *Pictorial Dictionary*, issued in 1862, it is affirmed that 'forty millions of Webster's Dictionaries and Spellers have been sold in the United States,' and that 'the State of New York have (*sic*) placed 10,000 copies of Webster's Unabridged (*i.e.* the large quarto dictionary) in as many of the public schools.' Further a letter from D. Appleton and Co. of New York under date May 2, 1859, is also printed in the following terms: 'We publish Webster's *Elementary Speller* and other educational works recognising Webster's Dictionary as their general standard of orthography, the current manufacture and sale of which are at the rate per annum of about 2,500,000.' Other firms writing at the same time from other parts of the United States mention figures hardly less astonishing. The meaning apparently must be that these firms followed Webster's spelling in the printing of educational books, and that they counted their whole annual output of these as bearing testimony to his authority. Further it would appear from the discussions provoked by President Roosevelt's recent action that some twenty-five years ago Congress passed a law formally recognising Webster's Dictionary as the legal standard of Government spelling in the United States. This law, upheld as it has been by the decisions of the Supreme Court, seems to have put an end for the time to the President's projects of spelling reform.⁷

To turn for a moment to the more general question of phonetic spelling in the abstract, a point touched upon by Noah Webster in one of the extracts quoted above may remind us of the special difficulties attached to any phonetic system formulated on the other side of the Atlantic. English pronunciation differs much more from American pronunciation than English spelling does from American spelling. What is more, it would be much harder, as I conceive, to persuade the educated Englishman to say *toob* for *tube*, or *waunt* for *want*, than it would be to induce him to write *labor* for *labour*. Phonetic spelling will be a chimæra if it starts off by ignoring what is practically the uniform pronunciation of educated people. We must begin with

⁷ It is curious that in January 1890 a drastic scheme of spelling reforms to be adopted by the public printer was presented to the House of Representatives by Mr. Lawler and ordered by Congress to be printed. It will be found among the Congressional Documents, 51st Congress, 1st Session, *H. Misc. Docs.*, vol. i. The scheme, it would seem, never passed into law.

some standard of pronunciation. And here I venture to say, though with much friendly appreciation of the variety and brightness in the speech of our American cousins, that the advantages in this matter are all on the side of England. Educated England has in practice a uniform standard of pronunciation. Educated America, perhaps for the very reason that education has filtered down much deeper, cannot as yet be said, in spite of Webster's forecast, to speak with one and the same tongue.*

If Americans were agreed among themselves we should readily admit their equal claim to decide what is correct and what is incorrect in all that relates to our common language. But the prevalence of local modifications throughout the United States is, I submit, so patent, even upon the surface of cultured American fiction, that to select any one form as representative of American speech seems an injustice to the rest. I am not speaking, of course, of the dialect novels of such writers as J. Lane Allen and Constance Fenimore Woolson, any more than I am thinking of the English rustics depicted by Hardy and Blackmore, but the point turns upon the speech of the educated classes as represented in such novels as those of Mr. W. D. Howells, for instance, whose finished portraits often owe much to the skilful presentment of peculiarities of accent and diction.

A novelist on this side of the water, having told us that his heroine is English, has practically nothing more to say about the way she talks. She talks—English, and if her voice is exceptionally melodious or the reverse, or if she has a piquant lisp or has learnt from a French governess a trick of trilling her *r*'s, the peculiarity is recognised as personal and not generic. On the other hand Mr. Howells's leading ladies, while socially unexceptionable, often afford quite an interesting study in the phonetics of the different American centres of fashion. Thus the conversation of Miss Julia Van Hook Anderson in *April Hopes* is made audible to the mental ear by such a presentment as the following:

I think she's moybid, Alice is [she said with that peculiar liquefaction of the canine letter which New Yorkers alone have the trick of], she isn't moybid in the usual sense of the woyd, but she expects more of herself and the woyld generally than anybody's going to get out of it.

So Mr. Howells transliterates Miss Anderson's pronunciation of *church* as *chuych*, of *girl* as *giyl*, of *puritan* as *puyitan*, of *hurry up*, as *hu'y up*, and the same fashionable personage talks of 'seyve you right,' or 'hayd woyk,' and complains of things that are 'peyfectly disheaytning.' On the other hand when we are introduced to the grave and refined Colonel Woodburn of Virginia we find him

* It is remarkable that Webster himself, in the preface to his Dictionary of 1841, notices that for an Englishman the standard of pronunciation was the practice of educated people. It was to this Englishmen appealed, and not to any book. Americans, on the other hand, referred all disputes to the decision of a dictionary.

accompanied by an equally charming young lady who voices unabashed her native dialect in such a passage as the following :

His daughter was short, plump, and fresh-coloured, with an effect of loveliness that did not at all express itself in her broad-vowelled, rather formal speech with its odd valuations of some of the auxiliary verbs and its total elision of the canine letter. 'We awe from the South,' she said, 'and we arrived this mawning, but we got this cyahd [card] from the brokah just befo' dinnah, and so we awe rathah late.' . . . 'Ah'm a hoase-keepah mahself,' Miss Woodburn joined in, 'and Ah know ho' to acyoant fo' everything.'

Elsewhere she says, 'Come raght with me this minute if the cyoast's clea.' 'Oh what a cyowahd.' 'Ah shall be jost wald to know ho its toned oat.'

Compare this passage from Mr. Henry James's *Bostonians* :

He came in fact from Mississippi and he spoke very perceptibly with the accent of that country. It is not in my power to reproduce by any combination of characters this charming dialect; but the initiated reader will have no difficulty in evoking the sound, which is to be associated in the present instance with nothing vulgar or vain. This young man is . . . the most important personage in my narrative. And yet the reader who likes a complete image, who desires to read with the senses as well as with the reason, is entreated not to forget that he prolonged his consonants and swallowed his vowels, that he was guilty of elisions and interpolations which were equally unexpected, and that his discourse was pervaded by something sultry and vast, something almost African in its rich basking tone, something that suggested the teeming expanse of the cotton field.¹⁰

If New York or Virginia lay on the outskirts of the vast American territory, or if they were brand-new States whose aristocracy was still represented by trappers and gold-diggers, one would understand the existence of marked divergences of pronunciation. But one is surprised to find that neither Webster's Dictionary nor even the railways have produced as yet any stronger impulse towards uniformity. No doubt it will be urged in regard to these variations in the speech of educated Americans that even New York and Virginia from a literary point of view are only provincial. It is New England that forms the intellectual centre of the country. It is the speech of New England which has the best claim to be accounted the true home of the American tongue.

But, as it happens, we possess an authoritative presentment of the pronunciation of New England which is of quite exceptional value in this connection. No American scholar in the last half-century has achieved greater distinction than the late Professor William Dwight Whitney, who amid many other literary undertakings was

* *Hazard of New Fortunes*, Part II., ch. 2.

¹⁰ *The Bostonians*, p. 5. Compare Harold Frederic, *Illumination*: 'He knew that she was born in the South, because she said so. When she told about this, her ordinarily sharp voice took on a mellow cadence, with a soft, drawling accent, turning u's into o's, and having no r's to speak of' (p. 142).

the chief editor of the *Century Dictionary*. Professor Whitney was a philologist who took a particular interest in scientific phonetics, which implies that his ear was trained to observe and to record minute distinctions of sound, and in the paper from which I propose to quote he had been addressing himself primarily, not to a popular audience, but to a learned association of specialists, who seem to have received his statements as scientifically accurate.

Taking his own speech as 'fairly representative of that of the ordinarily educated New Englander from the interior,'¹¹ Professor Whitney proceeds to analyse and classify the spoken sounds of the language with their written equivalents, and in so doing he makes known many peculiarities of utterance which to say the least would be accounted eccentric if heard on this side of the Atlantic.

Professor Whitney, we learn, pronounced the words *pant*, *gape*, *blaspheme* with the vowel sound which is heard in *father*, or *far*. He tells us that as a boy he learned to say *ketch* for *catch* and to give the same short *e* sound to the vowels in *plague*, *snake*, and *naked*. *Deaf* was quite commonly uttered as if it rhymed with *leaf*, though the pronunciation of the word usual in England was not unfamiliar. Speaking of the 'au-sound,' the vowel heard in *cause*, or in *all*, Professor Whitney is satisfied that in his own usage and in that of a large proportion of his countrymen this sound is heard in such words as *want*, *wrong*, *song*, which he consequently pronounced himself in a way that we may best represent to the eye by writing *waunt*, *wraung*, *saung*. Further, if I understand him aright, he himself unquestionably used the same vowel in speaking the words *God* and *dog* (*Gaud* and *daug*); though it is only fair to say that he protests against the facile caricature to which such an admission may expose him.¹²

¹¹ 'My place of residence and education up to sixteen years old was in Massachusetts, on the Connecticut River, at Northampton—a shire town of long standing which in my youth had not lost its ancient and well-established reputation as a home of "old families," and a scene of special culture and high-bred society; the birthplace of President Timothy Dwight and long the home of President Jonathan Edwards.

'My father was a merchant and banker, not himself a college-taught man, but son of a Graduate of Harvard; my mother's parents were from the shore of Connecticut, her father a clergyman and Graduate of Yale.'—*Oriental and Linguistic Studies*, Vol. II. p. 203.

¹² I can conceive that this point might be contested on the ground that in the *Century Dictionary*, edited by Professor Whitney, the pronunciation referred to is only given as an alternative, and is then indicated by the symbol *ô*, which, according to the table, represents the sound of *o* in *nor* or in *off*, and is distinguished from *â*, which stands for the *au* in *clause*. These vowels (i.e. the *o* in *nor* and the *au* in *clause*) are distinguished also by Mr. Alex. J. Ellis (*English Pronunciation*, Part IV. p. 1099) and by the *English Historical Dictionary*. But Professor Whitney was explicit in saying that his own pronunciation did not distinguish them. 'In my own usage,' he writes, 'I am perfectly persuaded that all the words I have given (*form*, *off*, *song*, *caught*, *broad*, &c.) have precisely the same "au-sound," although it would be easy, by drawling and distorting the utterance even a very little, to make some of them seem ungraceful and vulgar; and I would say the same of *God*, *dog*, and their like,

Again Professor Whitney seems fully to endorse a peculiarity which used to strike me much in the speech of a Bostonian of my acquaintance—a peculiarity which did not in any way sound vulgar, but is certainly unusual in England. It is the giving of the full sound of the *o* in *note* (really a diphthong, or a long vowel *plus* a vanishing glide¹⁵) to the *o* occurring before *r* in such words as *glory*, *story*, *tory*, &c., and even *memoir*¹⁴ (!!) which are consequently uttered as *glow-ry*, *stow-ry*. This pronunciation is indicated, without any alternative, right through the *Century Dictionary*; and if the reader will look at the pronunciation figured in that lexicon for two such words as *story* and *stony*, he will find that the vowels are in both cases represented as precisely the same *stō'ri* and *stō'ni*. Whether Professor Whitney would also have accepted the strong secondary accent which the same Boston friend introduced in the third syllable of words like *migrato'ry* (almost *migratowry*), *purgato'ry*, &c., his essay does not show. But the *Century Dictionary* does not recognise it even as optional.

Passing to another sound of *o* or rather *u* Professor Whitney remarks:—

The words *rood*, *roof*, and *root* are words in which one often hears the short instead of the long sound, and *root* especially is very widely and commonly pronounced like *foot*. I learned it so, and still give it so, unless by a conscious effort. I also naturally give the same vowel sound to *does*, and it is evidently historically older than the present approved utterance, rhyming to *buzz*.

To follow the Professor further in his expositions of the elementary sounds of New England speech would only be tedious. We may briefly note that according to him the pronunciation of *wounds* (plagæ) as rhyming with *hounds* was quite common, and was not regarded as less educated than its alternative; also that the vowel sounds in *whole* and in *none* were identical to his ear, neither of them coinciding with the English utterance. Finally in regard to the very keenly debated question of the American *u*, it is sufficient to say that the list of words given, in which Professor Whitney recognises only a long *u* (the *u* in *rude*), where we in England iotise it (the *u* in *pure*), seems to an Englishman portentous, e.g. *tube*, *tuition*, *nude*, *attune*, *produce*, *pursue*, *fortuitous*, *credulity*, *annuity*, *penurious*, etc. In each of these cases the editor of the *Century Dictionary* considered that the *u* should be spoken with

in which many persons certainly give the "short *o* sound of *not*." See 'The Elements of English Pronunciation' in *Linguistic Studies*, Vol. II. p. 215. To Professor Whitney obviously the 'short *o*' sound in *God* and *dog* was the less usual. The *Century* gives both pronunciations as admissible, but the *Standard* only recognises the 'short *o*' sound common in this country.

¹³ See the discussion in A. J. Ellis's *Early English Pronunciation*, Part IV. pp. 1152 and 1108.

¹⁴ Professor Whitney names *beau*, *yeoman*, *memoir* and *sew* as pronounced with the same vowel sound (*loc. cit.* 216).

the full sound of *oo*, *toob*, *toonion*, and so on.¹⁵ This, be it noticed, is no exaggeration of the English stage Yankee, but the deliberate verdict of the most distinguished American orthoëpist of our times.

The facts discussed above seem to suggest as a conclusion that the American projects for the reform of our common language must almost necessarily be viewed by the average Englishman with a certain measure of suspicion. He may be content to follow the lead of America in the field of mechanical invention and in certain branches of science, but the spelling of English is another matter. For this reason I believe that there are many sincere advocates of a phonetic orthography who, like myself, will regret the somewhat precipitate action of President Roosevelt. It is the general reader who needs to be conciliated. The specialist is convinced already. But a reform confessedly incomplete, coming from outside and closely associated with the prejudices which have long been felt against American spelling and pronunciation, can hardly make a favourable impression upon the public opinion of Great Britain. It is likely to retard rather than advance the day when the phonetic problem will be considered in this country with an open mind and purely on its own merits.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹⁵ It should perhaps be said that though the pronunciation of most American speakers seems to bear out the statement of Professor Whitney, the *Century Dictionary* in all these cases indicates an iotised *u* in accordance with English usage.

THE CHILDREN OF FLORENCE

THERE is a street in Florence of so little importance that, could I recall its name, it would probably convey nothing to the vast number of English people who yet know and love the city as an intimate friend. It is a long and winding street, and if you follow it far enough it will lead you almost from the heart of Florence, where life and business circulate incessantly round the steps of the Duomo, right out into the country. At one end of it the blue hills, except in the height of summer, are overtopped by a line of glistening snow; and if you stand at a corner midway down the street, and look towards the city, you will see Giotto's Tower spring straight above the clustering roofs, as transparent in its delicate tracery as the blue and golden sky behind it, and almost as dazzling where it is caught by the sun as the snow itself. There are no obvious treasures to tempt sight-seers to wander down the street, no especial buildings of historic or artistic interest, and yet what an inexhaustible storehouse of mystery and enchantment the most insignificant byway in Florence may become! Here we have two long lines of yellow houses with brown-tiled roofs, and beneath the carved wooden cornices an even row of green-shuttered windows. Over almost every door is a delicate piece of ironwork, generally fan-shaped and scarcely two alike. But it is on the ground floor that lurks the mystery, in those cavernous depths which now seem to run back to an unfathomable distance, and again, in the very next house, are only a few feet deep, a mere hole in the wall! Here an archway leads with unexpected abruptness into a beautiful Renaissance courtyard, where the Pandolfini dolphins on the capitals of the columns speak of bygone splendour, whilst a few yards further on a similar archway will drop the unwary intruder straight into the cellar of a charcoal-burner. Or, again, the more majestic arch gives place to a tiny doorway, from which a steep stone staircase hurries straight up to unknown regions above. But these things which, to the trained eye of the artist who first found them for me, have an intrinsic value, are in my mind merely a part of the Street of the Children, for by no other name do I know it. Everybody must find his own means of approach to the innermost secrets of the personality whom he would know and love. And it may be that

because a love of children is one of the leading characteristics of the Florentine, that it is through her children, through the *fanciullini* playing in her streets, playing on their mediæval backgrounds, that I sometimes think I have caught a glimpse into the heart of Florence. Every city, and especially every Italian city, has her lovers, Florence perhaps more than they all; for while her beauty is there for all to see, and she sits on the rich plain of Tuscany, with her lap full of the treasures she is so ready to show us, her charm is yet undefinable, elusive, and therefore it never tires.

And the same elusive charm seems to belong to her children. The type appears to have altered little since the days when those great masters, strolling through the streets of their beloved city, caught and immortalised the childish forms and faces, on canvas, in stone and in marble, wherewith to adorn her loveliness. It is rare to meet an absolutely plain child in Florence, but it is not only the dark eloquent eyes, the clear-cut features, the clean line of throat and chin, the graceful proportions of the small limbs to the body, but it is also a certain air of distinction and aloofness in their bearing which makes it a pure pleasure to watch these children at their play. I have heard it said that the real living child is almost as important a note in Florentine architecture as those charming *putti* which smile down upon us from all sorts of unexpected places, in churches, and over windows and archways in the street. Certainly the broad flights of church steps seem to afford the children a natural playground, and the visitor who wishes to enter must have the temerity to cross the chalked squares and circles upon which they play unending and elaborate games of hop-scotch. And it is not an unusual sight to find an extremely small baby seated against a mighty church door, such as that of Santa Croce, in complete and happy solitude. The larger the door apparently the smaller should be the baby who is set against it.

But it is in the street which seems to me to belong to them, above all others, that I have liked best to watch the children. For here they may be seen and studied in their own surroundings, and of the invading *forestieri* they will take little or no notice. While the daylight lasts the street is their home, and from end to end, except in school hours, it is alive with childish noise and chatter. There are few grown-up people to be seen, and none who show any tendency to interfere with the children. True, about half-way down the street there is the gentleman who keeps a *Gran Deposito* of trunks, one ancient portmanteau representing his legitimate business, companioned by a wonderful toy circus cut out in cardboard. Mysterious odds and ends of iron and brasswork fill up the background, and the shop window is flanked on either side with wire baskets full of hard-boiled eggs, a never-failing refrain in this street, where the modern craze for specialising has not yet penetrated. Further up is the old woman who sells china pots

and *canzone*, sentimental poems about the rose and the nightingale, printed upon pink and blue and orange papers, and fastened on a bare space along the wall of her house. Some of the *canzone* are not printed at all, but written in a large sprawling hand on a piece of copy-book paper, and then they are sold for only one *soldo* instead of two, and the ardent lover who is also economical sometimes has to bring his purchase in to have it read aloud to him. But the children do not care for these things. Near the top of the street is a greengrocer's stall, and who that knows Florence does not know the greengrocers? This one is content with a mere recess in the wall, with folding shutters which open outwards. Each morning he industriously hangs his wares upon all the myriad little nails he has driven into his shutters—bunches of pink young radishes, fresh green leeks, strings of onions stretched across the opening. And on the shelf, arranged in skilful picturesque confusion, are cauliflowers, lettuces, red tomatoes, heaps of oranges and lemons, their leaves still clustering upon them, bright patches of colour against the cavernous background; and where a gap occurs there are always the hard-boiled eggs. All the patient industry of the Italian race asserts itself in this unwearied individual, who so elaborately builds up his *bottega* in the morning, parts apparently with little during the day, and demolishes the whole edifice each evening.

At the very entrance to the street is a bird shop, a place of wonder and delight to the children, and indeed to all who have ever given a serious thought to the question of bird-cages. Here are cages of green wood, of red wood, of blue wood, brilliant and faded, bell-shaped, square, large and small, and all arranged with a great and apparent carelessness and as genuine an eye for effect as the leeks and the radishes of the greengrocer. Certainly a curious sense of proportion pertains in Florence. Just as the rule of the children seems to be that the larger the church door the smaller the baby, so here it is the larger the bird the smaller the cage. An immense pigeon endeavours to turn itself slowly round for the benefit of an admiring childish audience in a minute wicker cage which can scarcely contain its unwieldy proportions, whilst tiny foreign birds with glowing plumage are able to take quite considerable flights in their green wooden prison which occupies the length of the window. As I have said, the Florentine child takes but little notice of the passing stranger, and in this he differs amazingly from the frivolous child of Siena. How much of the past history of these rival republics can, I wonder, be traced to this curious difference in temperament! Even in the street which I regard as their own, and where foreign intruders are few enough, the children are smilingly indifferent to their presence. A boy rather bigger than the rest has found a small hand-wagon, standing outside the stall of the greengrocer, who presumably has gone to his dinner. Into this he has crowded his younger brethren, and careers wildly down the street, a cartload of shouting, exultant blue pinafores behind him.

The aged, wrinkled grandmother who sells the *canzone*, presumably in charge of all the community whilst the parents are at work, looks out of her doorway to admonish them, but very mildly, and she smiles at little Guido with his name embroidered in red letters on his black pinafore who is playing in the gutter. She smiles also indulgently at the *forestieri* who are showing such surprising interest in the ordinary and trivial amusements of her young charges. But Guido has caught the sound of military music far away in the great world, and is clattering up the street as fast as his little legs can carry him. If he charges into the interloping strangers that is their fault, they can have no possible business in the street, but he bestows upon their injured persons a discreet and charming smile as he gallops on his way. Almost, but not quite, for he stands in wholesome awe of his own contemporaries, he collides with a row of little girls, who arm in arm are dancing down to meet him, their backs indifferently turned to that gay scene towards which he is flying. They are not above a coquettish glance at the strangers as they toss their curls out of their eyes and chant their quaint little song of the city which yet seems to have a refrain of *La Bella Napoli*. Presently the row breaks, the little girls group themselves in a circle round a toddling boy they have captured, and as they slowly revolve begin to sing what is obviously the equivalent of 'A ring a ring of roses' as danced and sung in approved fashion in an English nursery. The tune is certainly the same, but the words are addressed to 'Maria Giulia,' though whether this refers to the baby in the middle or to some pagan deity remains a mystery. Too obvious a curiosity upon the part of the bystander merely results in a dispersal of the ring, and a reforming of the row, which moves to a safer distance.

But the noonday sun is exceedingly hot, and one small boy has twisted his graceful limbs round the stone upright fountain, and in this contorted attitude he is endeavouring to adjust his mouth to that of the dolphin from which the water gushes. That a younger boy with a stick at least six times as long as himself should interfere with these efforts is inevitable; but when might has once again proved right, the loan of the stick for three blessed minutes appears to restore complete tranquillity. So the sun blazes and the children shout, and the grandmother sleeps composedly, for customers are few, and it is seldom that a cart or a carriage comes down the street to interrupt them. Only in the distance can be heard the roar of grown-up life and business.

But just as there are few parents in the street at this hour, so there are very few babies—babies, that is, who are too small to play. The reason of this is not very far to seek. Grandmothers who sell sentimental poems cannot always be trusted, and babies are very precious possessions in Florence. Only half a mile away, on the ground floor of a house, which in greater days might have been a

palace, is a nursery where the babies pass happy and well-cared-for days while their mothers are away at work. The *crèche* of Santa Caterina was founded some years ago by a rich and philanthropic Florentine lady, and was confided to the care of the same order of Sisters who are responsible for the wellbeing of the little foundlings at the Hospital of the Innocenti. The nurseries open off a courtyard surrounded by a little cloister. In the middle of the court are a couple of palms and an ancient well where the pigeons come down to drink and to look at the babies. Only a headless wooden horse occupies the court to-day, for in spite of the sunshine a cold wind is blowing and the babies are considered safer indoors. Here, in the bright airy nursery with its polished floor, a little row of them is seated on a tiny wooden bench, each seat being separated by minute wooden arms from its neighbour. In front of them is a proportionately tiny desk attached to the bench, upon which are placed their toys. By this arrangement they are quite safe. These mites range in age from about six months to two years, and only the eldest of them could have been expected to support himself upright in the centre of the ring for that mysterious game of *Maria Giulia*. Beyond a well-aimed blow directed at a neighbour on either side, the sturdiest of these infants cannot get into a great deal of mischief. In the middle of the room is a curious circular wooden frame in which the babies may teach themselves to walk. An atom of nine months is making valiant efforts to maintain her equilibrium inside this ingenious construction at the moment that we enter. 'That is Anastasia,' says the Sister proudly; 'she is very active, but she cannot hurt herself'; and so it appears. Little cots are ranged round the walls, for as the Sister explains, with undisguised relief, at their age some of the day may be dedicated to sleep. Over the cots are coloured texts, alternating with more mundane matter among which are two gaudy advertisements of English soap. 'Good children never cry.' *Bambini buoni gridano mai* is writ large over the door. 'And do they never cry?' is my indiscreet inquiry. The Sister smiles demurely. 'In the summer when they can play in the court, and in the winter when they sleep, all is well—they are good, Signorina; but sometimes, in the spring, when the east wind blows'—she raises her hands expressively—'one begins, and then they may cry all together for days.' At that moment the little Anastasia, whose legs have crumpled up under her inside the frame, and who is disinclined to make the effort to rise again unassisted, sets up a wail of dissatisfaction. The Sister darts to her rescue, but there is no remonstrance, no discipline enforced. The baby is gathered to warmth and comfort—these women have the true instinct, or else are admirably trained into a semblance of maternity—cajoled and comforted and carried off to her cot to rest. This she does not immediately consent to do, and remembering the tradition of the east wind, which is certainly blowing this April day, we wait anxiously for the chorus of lamentation from her companions which

may be expected to follow. But the babies upon their benches remain tolerably good and silent for the moment. A little confidential murmur over the toys, an occasional threatening growl like that of a puppy as a favourite top or ball is snatched by a marauding neighbour, alone disturb the peace at this end of the nursery. Perhaps they are a little overawed by the visitors, though even at this tender age they have the same air of aloofness as the older children. On a shelf over Anastasia's cot sits a charming but dissipated Punchinello, who for ever smiles and tries to clap his cymballed hands, regardless of the fact that his spinal cord has long been broken. Above this amiable reprobate hang the words, painted in gold letters upon a silver ground, 'And Thy Guardian Angel shall watch over thee.' The profanity is naturally unconscious, and the little Anastasia will sleep none the worse for the peculiar guardian whom chance has selected to watch over her slumbers. But now it is near dinner-time; little tongues are suddenly let loose upon the benches, and some powerful lungs are being exercised to express disapproval of what seems to their owners an unconscionable delay. The tired face of the Sister as she parts from us in the cloister leads us into yet another indiscretion. 'And do you never get tired of them, do you never go away?' But this time she is really pained. 'We never get tired of the babies,' she replies with mild reproof, 'and as for going away, *chi lo sa*. Signorina? I may be here to-day and gone to-morrow, to Rome, to Sicily, even to South America, who knows; we are all soldiers, we obey orders.' Then, unbending a little, for she sees that genuine interest and not mere curiosity has prompted the question, she adds, with more animation, 'but the Signore should ask to see the hospital of the Innocenti, that is our real work.'

It is no distance from the *crèche* of Santa Caterina to the piazza outside the church of the Santissima Annunziata, where for four and a half centuries, childhood, depicted in its most beautiful, and at the same time its most pathetic, aspect, has looked down upon the busy life for ever hurrying by. This piazza is, perhaps, the place of all others in Florence where the inveterate loafer unwilling to leave the sunshine, and satiated for the moment with the treasures of church and picture gallery, may feel justified in lingering. It may be added that the steps under the graceful arcade which faces the Innocenti Hospital offer an obvious and delectable resting-place. An incessant stream of life flows daily through the piazza, trams laden with country people returning from market, bound for the heights of Fiesole, and with city folk also, perhaps only going a couple of hundred yards, for nobody in Florence walks if he can drive; whilst long carts of the country rattle after them, carrying twice as much of humanity as they are intended to hold. And yet this square, one of the busiest in the city, retains a curious atmosphere of repose. Possibly it is because the traffic never pauses nor diverges from its course to disturb the harmony about it, but is rather like a stream flowing through a quiet

meadow. At least this is how I have found it on week-days. On Sundays and on *festas*, when the fashionable world flocks to the Church of the Annunziata and to the Chapel of the Innocenti, it is another matter. Here a few children are generally playing, but in a quiet and orderly fashion, about the bronze and marble sea monsters of Tacca, which serve as fountains. Upon the right the great bronze statue of Duke Ferdinand the First, seated on his horse, gazes for ever at a blank window in the palace, where once the bust of his lady smiled back at him. Theirs was surely a meritorious dilatoriness, for had the wooing been conducted with the heat and fervour extolled by youth, another bloody crime would have been added to the domestic history of Florence. So there he stands, a mighty monument to the negative virtue of delay! But it is the lovely façade of the Foundling Hospital, the Spedale degl' Innocenti, which gives its chief beauty and character to the piazza. To all those who know Florence, it is sufficiently familiar. The long harmonious lines of Brunelleschi's design, suggesting a rare combination of strength and simplicity, the wide shallow steps, the rounded columns, and, above the arches, the della Robbia medallions of the swaddled babies, the blue of the porcelain contrasting very graciously with the sad grey of the stone. Each exquisite representation of helpless infancy differs from the other, each instinct with life and grace and pathos. For over four hundred years the colouring of these medallions has withstood wind and weather, for did not Luca find out the secret—which he transmitted to his nephew Andiea, amongst whose early work the medallions have been classed—of beauty in external decoration which could safely be used *dove sono acque*? In the courtyard of the Hospital, over the round arches of the cloisters, the design of the swaddled babies is repeated; but here, though the delicate blue and grey colouring is the same, the babies are only painted upon plaster. Above them, on the upper storey, painted in the same manner, are the instruments of the Passion, the cock of the Bigallo, and repeated at intervals the *porta*, the gate, which is the badge of the Guild of Silk Workers.

The building of the Spedale degl' Innocenti, which may well, both for age and beauty, as well as for scientific development, stand before all the foundling hospitals of the world, is not so old as the actual society, for MSS. containing lists of regulations for such a society for the protection of foundling children, dated in the twelfth century, exist amongst the archives of Florence. But in the fifteenth century, in 1421, owing to the eloquent appeal of Leonardo Bruni, the famous scholar, and secretary of the Republic, who, as his monument in Santa Croce tells us, 'enjoyed the sunshine of favour in the palace of Cosimo de' Medici,' the Hospital as we see it to-day was actually founded. There is perhaps no stronger testimony to the Florentine love of little children than is to be found in the names of the great masters of that magnificent period who gave their work to adorn with exquisite and tender sentiment the refuge of destitute and nameless infancy.

In the gloom of the cloister, over the entrance to the Church of the Innocenti, gleams a beautiful della Robbia relief of the Annunciation, surrounded with its lovely garland of cherub heads. In the church itself, behind the altar, Ghirlandajo's *Adoration of the Magi*, with the two little murdered innocents who, kneeling in their white robes before the Saviour, have entered into glory, conveys the same feeling of gentle compassion for the young and helpless which is the dominating note in all the decoration of the Hospital. We find it again in the pictures in the board room, in the work of Piero di Cosimo, Ghirlandajo's predella, and in that most tender picture of Filippo Lippi's, in which a boy angel brings the Christ Child to the Madonna. It repeats itself in the minutest detail of decoration in the interior, in the winged heads of the *putti* over the doorways; and there is always the same sense of harmony with Brunelleschi's bold and simple design, as in the medallions over the arcade without. The Hospital was for a time generously assisted by the Medicean Grand Dukes, whose busts stand under the arcade, patrons of the artists who were employed upon the building, but it was placed at the outset especially under the management of the Guild of Silk Weavers, who endowed it with a tax on every pound of silk spun or woven in Florence. Very soon a papal bull raised it to the dignity of an 'ecclesiastical place,' a dignity which it enjoys to the present day.

For a time, after its foundation, very few babies were brought to the Hospital; perhaps the mothers were a little shy of the sumptuous building and the grand-ducal patronage. Their anonymity was however completely secured, for the babies were, as they still are, of so tender an age that they could be passed through the bars of a window which has only recently been walled up. The first infant to be so received was baptized on the 5th of February, 1445, and was named Agata Smeralda. Gradually, in those early days the society increased its funds by the absorption of smaller analogous institutions, such as the Hospital of La Scala, and in time it became possessed of considerable property in the city. Everybody who knows the streets of Florence must have noticed over the doors of certain houses the sign of the swaddled babies, painted on plaster, which marks them as the property of the Innocenti. In spite of so prosperous a beginning, the Hospital of the Innocents has passed through more than one severe financial crisis. More especially was this the case during the occupation of the French, when Napoleon, with his particular genius for using up waste material, decreed that all foundlings of the male sex over the age of fourteen should be enrolled in a boy regiment, whilst those between eleven and fourteen should be utilised as middies. Four centuries and a half have passed since Agata Smeralda was received, with how much interest and ill-suppressed agitation, we may imagine, by the initiators of this princely scheme. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then, and at the present day between seven and eight thousand foundlings are annually supported by the

society, although comparatively few of them are housed in the actual building.

The history of the Innocenti Hospital is a curious and instructive study in evolution. Here the babies are still swaddled in the approved Tuscan fashion, which has never changed with the ages, and which is immortalised in the della Robbia medallions. And not so long ago an administrative council was formed whose sole object is to see that every newest and most sanitary invention and practice is employed for the benefit of these nameless waifs, who are lodged and fed and nursed upon the best and most scientific principles in Europe. No heir to a kingdom could be reared upon more hygienic methods or, we may add, be more tenderly cared for. Art is long, as every stone of Brunelleschi's building and its decorations indicates, but that life, if it must still be limited in duration, shall have the best possible chance from the beginning, no matter how doubtful that beginning may have been, is now the one preoccupation of the Council of Administration and of the Sisters of Charity who perform the active and practical work of the institution. The good Sister who does the honours of the Hospital, older, and for that reason, perhaps, more placid and less weary in appearance than our friend at the *crèche*, is naturally interested rather in the modern improvements wrought by scientific discovery than in the beautiful setting and the original elements upon which the present conditions of hygienic perfection have been grafted. Her face lights up with genuine satisfaction when she realises that we do not merely want to see the pictures, admire the excellent proportions of the cloister, and hasten with all speed into the chapel, but that we are genuinely interested in the babies themselves and in every domestic detail of their arrangements. And so, with pardonable pride and pleasure, she conducts us to the spotless room which has replaced that barred window of former days through which the soft little bodies must have been pushed with very considerable discomfort. Here they are received—and they may be a few hours or a few days old—duly registered, and a religious medal is hung round the neck of each infant, by which it may be identified through life. Here is the weighing machine, and the rows of hot cupboards where the tiny garments in which they are to be clothed are duly warmed. We see and admire the latest invention for sterilising milk, and the immense shoot by which the soiled linen is sent straight down into the laundry. It has been no easy matter to convert one of the most beautiful of mediæval buildings into a modern nursery, and that this has been successfully accomplished without structural alteration or tampering with its admirable proportions is a triumph of ingenuity and good taste. No corners are allowed, every angle has been carefully rounded, so that the microbes may have no convenient resting place. In the ward set apart for infectious cases, there are glass panes let into the dividing wall in order that all direct contact with the Sisters nursing the little patients may be avoided, and that

they may yet when necessary be superintended at their work. Of course, these babies have their own doctor. What indeed have they not? Out in the old garden, itself four or five hundred years old, they keep their own beautiful white cow, who, sumptuously lodged in a white enamelled room, with a floor polished like a mirror, has little enough in common with her mediæval setting. And yet to reach this most hygienic stable we pass along the very gallery by which the members of the Medici family were wont to slip through to Mass in the church without being observed. Each successive cow pays with her life for her exalted position, since before the lymph can be used to vaccinate the little foundlings, and indeed all the aristocratic babies of Tuscany, she must be killed in order that her complete healthiness may be duly certified. Up in the long rows of night nurseries, each white cot hangs beside the bed of the nurse told off to attend to the little occupant. Beyond is the great circular day nursery, with its wide windows looking across a foreground of housetops to Fiesole and the blue hills in the distance, to the vineyards clothed in their delicate young green, here and there a clump of grey olives or a flowering almond amongst them, and below to the Arno glistening in the sun. In the middle of the room is a large table covered with all the necessary appliances of the toilet. The nurses sit round in a circle dressed in thick white washing material, each with a little stiff baby on her knee, with helpless hanging head and tiny combative fists, yet, swaddled in its white bands and supported by its pillow, able apparently at two or three days old to stand as upright as any sentinel. The nurses, fine handsome women some of them, the majority of whom, poor souls, have forfeited their legitimate claim to motherhood, are yet inordinately proud of their adopted charges, and there is much rivalry for the notice of the visitors. The babies however are less pleased with our attentions. One unhappy mite of a week old offers a feeble whimper of protest at its nurse's well-intended efforts to transfer it to unfamiliar and less practised arms. Some slightly older and much lustier voices join in a chorus, which is echoed in different keys from every night nursery in the building, and, mindful of that hint about the east wind, we hasten after the Sister into the wardrobe room, where are cupboards full of the babies' trousseaux waiting to go away with them, each little bundle neatly tied up with green ribbons.

The question inevitably arises in the mind of the visitors what is to become of these waifs, nurtured in the first few weeks of their lives with such infinite care, in the hard future that the world too often holds in store for foundlings?

But the Sister expresses surprise, not unmixed with reproach, at our anxiety. Why, surely they will be well cared for! The *bambini*, she explains, when they are little more than a fortnight old, are sent out into the country to the peasants, but before they go the woman who is to take charge of them has to come and stay a day or two at

the Hospital in order that she may learn her duties, and that the authorities may decide whether she be worthy of her charge. Wherever the baby goes there is a 'correspondent' who reports upon its progress. 'In the country they are so happy, *i poveri*,' exclaims the Sister. 'They grow fat and rosy, and the people love them as well as their own children; sometimes they even adopt them.' If this does not happen, the foundlings are brought back when they are older, and work is found for them, but it is always with reluctance that the adopted parents see them go. For the girls, most of whom are placed in service, the Council of Administration holds itself responsible until they are thirty-five, and if in that interval, as is usual, they marry, it provides them with a suitable dowry. Surely this is a paradise for children, where every detail of their future is so carefully thought out, and perhaps it is a reminiscence of certain unsavoury newspaper tales of our own country, of baby-farmers, and other means by which illegitimate and pauper children are sometimes disposed of, which causes the Sister to read incredulity upon our faces. 'The signore should go out into the country and see them,' she exclaims reproachfully. Sometimes, owing to death or some other cause, seldom indeed to ill-treatment, it is necessary to change the little ones' homes, and then they come back to the Hospital for a visit. As the Sister is speaking we pass into a smaller room, where, seated on the floor on half a dozen cushions, are as many babies, boys and girls, ranging in age from six to eighteen months. Very charming babies they are, almost any one of whom might have sat in the della Robbia studio for Master Andrea. They are all in clean pink pinafores, thick socks, and stout boots, their curly hair, in the case of the girls, tied up with pink ribbons, while the boys' heads are neatly shaven. They have rather the appearance of young birds, full-fledged be it understood, for the dark eyes are all fixed in expectancy upon a sweet-faced young Sister, who, passing slowly down the little row, drops pieces of carefully soaked bread into the open mouths, the wide wings of her white cap aiding the suggestion of the mother bird.

Before we go we are allowed a glimpse into what is perhaps the most pathetic, if not indeed the only really pathetic room in the Hospital. This is the room of the Archives of the Innocenti, where, on shelves upon shelves, are stored the records of the life of each child who has found shelter as a foundling since the days of Agata Smeralda. Every tiny incident in its career is here faithfully narrated—everything indeed, except its name; for the *incognito* of all the babies, even where the parentage is known, is preserved with scrupulous completeness. But it must not be supposed that any child goes through life nameless. Directly an infant has been received into the Hospital and registered, it is carried across into the Church of the Innocenti and duly baptized at the only font in Florence where baptisms are permitted, outside the Baptistery. Here it is given a

name to serve, in much the same spirit as it is given its religious medal, and naturally only the Sisters are in attendance. There is no christening party, no proud father and grandmother and relations to watch the salt put in the protesting baby's mouth, and oil poured upon his head, such as may be seen almost any day of the week in Giotto's Baptistery. The baby can obviously have no surname unless the kind-hearted peasant who, later, is to take him into his home will provide him with that also. But, after all, there is perhaps less opportunity for the bad fairies to be present at a christening where the mundane element is so conspicuous by its absence, and where such perfect expressions of allied beauty and innocence have been set to guard the entrance. Once a year, on the Saturday before Easter, the font is blessed with much solemnity, and a grand christening takes place, to which outsiders by favour are admitted, of the fortunate baby who at this propitious moment is the last to have been received into the Hospital.

'The signore should go out into the country and see them.' The good Sister's words recur to me as the light two-wheeled cart swings perilously round a sharp corner, crosses a little bridge, and stops with a jerk before a row of two or three whitewashed cottages. This is the Street of the Hundred Stars, a magnificent high-sounding name indeed to bestow upon a handful of little houses set down by the roadside in the midst of the *poderi*, a couple of miles out of Florence! And this is the village school to which the owner of the cart has given us an introduction. We are told that it is a rather superior school, for the parents pay here for the education of their children. Therefore it does not seem very probable that we shall find any foundlings among them. The interior, however, is modest enough—a brick floor, white-washed walls, a large placid schoolmistress, beaming with human kindness, and five or six children who may be any age between four and ten. The visitors are welcomed with enthusiasm, a blessed interruption no doubt to teacher and pupils alike. An excursion into the stone kitchen, where a beautiful carved mantelpiece seems to suggest that the house has known better days before the education of the village children was brought into question, and two rickety chairs are produced for our accommodation. We beg that there may be no disturbance of the ordinary course of study. The request seems to be superfluous. One boy alone, the eldest apparently of the party, a picturesque figure in rusty green and a slouch felt hat, which he retains upon his dark curls, sits writing at a wooden table, his chair tip-tilted, his nose extremely near the inkpot, much of the contents of which has been already scattered upon his person through the medium of a fine steel pen with which he is laboriously tracing letters in a copy-book. He is apparently the unwilling sacrifice offered upon the altar of education for the whole school. Leaning against the table is another and a younger boy, his arms crossed, his head laid repose-

fully upon them, his sleepy attention very fairly divided between the work of the scribe and the movements of the visitors. Round the room at intervals, upon extremely small rush-bottomed arm-chairs, such as are sold in the market at Prato, are two or three yet smaller boys, their blue linen overalls and scarlet caps lending bright touches of colour to the interior. Their little legs, clad in the usual thick woollen stockings and stout boots, are evidently intended by nature for running rather than for sitting still. But very still they are expected to sit, their fat arms folded upon their chests, and if it is all that is expected of them, it seems at this moment to be a good deal. One little boy near the door permits himself to gaze wistfully out upon the sun-baked road, upon the row of poplars which skirts the vineyard opposite, and the rapid dart of a lizard across the doorstep threatens for the moment to overrule his self-restraint. Presently his head nods forward, and his body appears to be in imminent danger of precipitating itself to the ground, but no doubt since it only rocks on the seat, daily practice has taught him to maintain his equilibrium. Another sweet fair blue-eyed baby of four, fair and stolid enough to belong to the Saxon rather than the Latin race, watches the visitors for a time with unwinking gaze. At intervals, however, the tight clasp of the chubby hands upon his elbows relaxes, the white beautifully modelled eyelids, which alone would proclaim him a Florentine, fall over the blue eyes. Only for a moment, however, he yawns, slowly, deliberately, clasps his elbows a little tighter, for this is obviously a child of determination, and resumes his stare. Poor babies ! the atmosphere is close. They have probably dined well on macaroni or polenta, and it would really be easier for them to be mastering their letters than retaining this painful rigidity. They must envy a rusty black kitten of amazing agility, which careers with irritating freedom about the room in pursuit of its own tail, the flies, or any other object of passing interest. There is only one little girl present, and she finds sufficient occupation in leaning against the back of the schoolmistress's chair. The appearance of a sketch book has made her self-conscious ; she giggles openly, thereby upsetting the boy at the table, for which they both receive a whispered, but evidently mild remonstrance from their placid instructress. The end of school hours is, however, approaching. From a nail on the wall above her head the school dame reaches down a slate—*Tutti buoni*—all good—is briefly inscribed upon it in enormous letters, and it is then restored to its place, that all who run may read of the virtue of her establishment. Well, the curriculum is at least simple. How astonished this amiable lady would be if she were told that at the present moment our country is torn asunder over the vexed question of the education of our children ! No doubt the village priest holds this little school in the hollow of his hand ; but of instruction, religious or secular, there appears to be very little—merely to learn to sit still can surely offer no ground

for controversy. After all, the schoolmistress cannot tell us much about her pupils when they have clattered out into the sunshine. But that it is a paying school she is careful to impress upon us. Yes, she admits, in her easy good-natured fashion, the peasants do adopt their foundlings sometimes. They are always good to them—they become as their own. Sometimes they even love them better than their own, and who is she that she should know the difference!

And so in the evening we come back to the Street of the Children, and I confess that, in spite of all the care and tenderness with which we have seen the babies of Florence surrounded in their institutions and schools, it is with something of relief that I find myself again among these merry irresponsible little beings, most of whom at all events own their full complement of parents, and who for the moment, the schools being let loose, are quite untrammelled by law or regulation. Yet here also the atmosphere is a little subdued. Giotto's Tower stands clear against a pale opal sky, inevitably reminding one of the lilies of the fields of the Mugello, where the boy was found tending or neglecting his father's sheep. Surely they were in his mind when he planned and reared this lovely fabric.

Upon the doorsteps clumps of little girls sit very close together like birds on a perch, whispering those secrets which little girls whisper all the world over, and which the boys must not hear, and which grown-up people could not possibly understand. At a window a fair-haired child, who should surely have wings about her head, leans out to throw down bread to a little girl in the street below, who holds up her skirt to receive it.

The greengrocer has already laboriously demolished his whole edifice of vegetables, and closed his shutters. The birdcage man is preparing to follow his example, and the many cages are being carefully conveyed into some hidden recess, to appear like the leeks and the onions upon the morrow. Even the hard-boiled eggs have nearly gone, and the grandmother is removing her *canzone* from the board on which all day they have exposed their tender sentiments. Groups of untiring little boys still shout and race up and down the street; but Guido's father has returned to lead him, an only half-reluctant captive, to supper and bed. Down the street come the tired mothers, who, the day's work over, have been to fetch their babies from the *crèche*. Clean, well-fed and sleepy, the little creatures may be exchanging the peaceful atmosphere with which the kind Sisters surround them for the bustle and clatter and discussions of their own less clean and airy homes. But they are quite content, as they nestle against the gaudy handkerchiefs which adorn their mothers' shoulders, and gaze out upon the shadowy world with dark solemn eyes. For will they not find awaiting them that atmosphere of love which seems to be the indisputable birthright of every child that is born in Florence?

GEOGRAPHY IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

WE should think but little of the possessor of a great estate, which he owed to the energy and industry of his forefathers, if he took no interest in its development; was ignorant of its capacities, boundaries, and extent; had never visited its outlying portions, and merely contented himself with spending the income which its possession secured him. For such an one the condemnation of the world would be general, for the obvious reason that the possession of property is universally admitted to entail certain accompanying responsibilities.

In many ways the inhabitants of the British Isles, and especially the wealthier classes of the population, have something in common with the inheritor of a great estate. By the energy, skill and perseverance of their ancestors vast dominions all over the world have been secured in perpetuity for the enjoyment of the Anglo-Saxon race, and a natural and splendid outlet for the expansion of the surplus population is afforded in every portion of the British Empire. For while every inch of land in the old country has long since passed into private ownership, the poorest British emigrant, without losing those privileges of citizenship which are his inalienable right, can at a minimum of cost, and in several cases at practically no cost at all, obtain the privilege of securing for himself under the British flag, and in some portion of a British colony, governed according to the common law of the motherland, ample acreage to provide a prosperous home for himself and his children. To liken the inhabitants of the British Isles to the inheritors of a vast and magnificent estate is, therefore, no unmeaning comparison; and the responsibilities of heirship are only increased by the fact that the Empire is an estate of unparalleled magnificence. Educationally, in such circumstances as these, it would seem a matter of course that a certain proportion of time should be set apart for the study and adequate comprehension of the diverse lands and territories which together form so valuable and enduring an asset; and, especially, it might *a priori* have been considered certain that in the great English public schools, which to so large an extent represent the wealth, the commerce, and the culture of England, the intelligent study of geography would

be insisted on and duly provided for, not merely as an admirable educational exercise, but (at least in reference to the British possessions over the seas) as a matter of the strictest practical import. While a French boy belonging to the wealthier classes might be expected to learn geography as part of a liberal education, it might reasonably have been supposed that an English public-school boy would, for practical reasons alone, receive a far more thorough and comprehensive geographical education, at least in regard to all those portions of the globe which are integral portions of the Empire of which he is a member.

As a matter of fact the case is almost exactly the reverse of what might have reasonably been anticipated on *a priori* grounds. The average French boy has probably a far better acquaintance with the geography of the world than the average English boy of the same class; while, if we turn to England itself, we find that, so far as the teaching of geography is concerned, the average Board school is probably ahead of the average public school; while in some secondary schools the methods adopted are incomparably superior to anything that has been accomplished on the average in our great public schools.

That there has been some improvement in the last few years I would not, of course, wish to deny; but even now the general system, or want of system, is singularly inadequate to the legitimate demands of an important and most practical subject; and in not a few instances very little progress seems to have been made in the ludicrously inefficient methods which were in vogue at Eton a quarter of a century ago. As an excellent object-lesson of a negative kind let me briefly recall the plan (if it can be so called) by which geography was supposed to be taught in the lower forms at Eton in the 'seventies and 'eighties. (I say the lower forms advisedly, because in the upper forms even this method of instruction was abandoned, and when a boy had reached a certain stage in the fifth form he was presumably supposed to have acquired sufficient geographical knowledge to enable him to dispense altogether with further assistance.)

The plan was as follows. Every week the form-master gave out in class the name of a certain country or other division of the world's surface which was to be reproduced as a map by each student of the division.¹ This map was set several days before it had to be shown up, so that there was practically a whole week open for its preparation. These maps, moreover, were marked as part of the weekly work, so that in any case where there was keen competition for the first place it became not only desirable, but indeed essential, for the leading boys in the class to produce such a map as should obtain full marks. Those who have never been at a public school can scarcely conceive what a spirit of keen, though friendly, emulation is produced among the leading boys of any particular class by a

¹ The Eton name for a 'class.'

system of weekly marks ; and this generous rivalry was never more manifestly exhibited than in the case of these weekly maps. The leading boys of the division would spend as much as ten to twelve hours a week on their individual maps, and the result from an artistic point of view was quite admirable. Many of these maps were, in fact, almost perfect as works of art, being coloured in the most exquisite way, while the names of the towns, &c., were filled in with the most delicate and accurate penmanship. Indeed, it was commonly reported (and even at this distance of time I see no reason for doubting the truth of the report) that one of these weekly maps was so exquisitely reproduced that the form-master had it framed and hung up in his study *pour encourager les autres*. But the result, though admirable, really had little or nothing to do with the teaching of geography. What was taught (and taught very well, though I am inclined to think at some waste of time) was *calligraphy*. The real, and in fact the sole, object in view being marks, the aim of each boy was to produce such a map as from the point of view of outward effect might be pronounced perfect ; and this half a dozen of the leading boys probably managed to effect every week. But their primary object being a high place in class, they cared nothing for the subject-matter of their illustrations. Whether it was China, Italy, or Australia that they were depicting was all the same to them. When the map was shown up the business was done, and they were not questioned as to their knowledge of its contents. The consequence was that the names were copied down parrot fashion, whether the place were Hong Kong or Naples being a matter of complete indifference ; the one important thing was to transcribe each individual name in the most exquisite style of penmanship. The geographical knowledge thus acquired was (I speak from bitter experience) nil. Indeed, those who have never tried this method can scarcely realise that it is possible to transcribe 'during a period of several hours every name on a map such as Italy, and yet at the end be totally ignorant of the geography of the country. I remember in particular one boy, who was a brilliant classical scholar, and subsequently at the university carried off almost every possible university distinction. I doubt if any of my contemporaries spent a longer time on their weekly maps or produced (after, it must be remembered, ten to twelve hours' weekly labour) such brilliant results. Yet when he was at the university, I remember, on a question arising as to some geographical point, that, notwithstanding the number of hours which he had nominally devoted to geography at Eton, he revealed almost complete ignorance on what was really a very elementary point. I suppose that he, like most of my contemporaries, was probably subsequently enabled in the course of travel to some extent to repair the deficiencies of his education in the matter of geographical knowledge. None the less does it seem a serious defect in the educational training of our greatest public

school that so many of her sons should in the past have left their *alma mater* with such lamentable ignorance of one of the most important branches of a modern liberal education; while Eton was certainly not in those days the exception to the rule. So far as Harrow is concerned, I can speak from personal knowledge, and I very much doubt whether the geographical instruction there imparted was in any way superior to that which was supposed to be given at Eton in the way I have just described. Indeed, from intercourse with other public-school men from most of the great public schools, I am inclined to believe that the Eton system, fatuous as it was, was not very much inferior to the average method adopted in other similar centres. I do not, of course, mean to imply that it was impossible to learn geography under the Eton system. I can still remember how one of my contemporaries, who is now no longer with us, had a natural inclination for the study of geography; which even the Eton system could not kill. He was not particularly anxious to shine in the class list, and I do not suppose that he devoted more than half or even a quarter of the time to his weekly map that at least half a dozen of his classmates gave to that task. But he had an innate love of geographical knowledge, and purely as a pastime he in his leisure hours would study his atlas without any reference to school work. He of course became an adept in the subject, and when he left Eton I suppose there were few boys of his own age in any part of the country who were better grounded in geography than he. But he is the one exception that I can remember to the general rule, that we neither knew nor cared to know anything of geography, a position which I am strongly inclined to suspect was shared by a good many of the masters.

And yet, surely there is no subject which, even on purely abstract grounds, might seem more worthy of an assured and definite place in any educational curriculum than geography. It has, compared with other branches of education, one enormous and unique advantage, in that its study, if properly directed, only requires a very moderate period of time. There is hardly any other of the subjects generally considered appropriate for the purposes of education of which the same advantage can be predicated. The study of the classics or of modern languages, the study of mathematics or the physical sciences, each, if they are to be effectually taught, takes up so large a proportion of a boy's working hours that in any curriculum of modern education it is becoming an increasingly difficult task to assign a fair proportion of time to the rival claimants without over-burdening the time-table to an extent which the considerations of health would necessarily forbid. Indeed, as a matter of fact, it is generally found impossible to give each of these rival studies a due place, and the consequence is that one or other has to be altogether abandoned; so that if it is desired (*exempli gratia*) that a boy should learn modern languages, he is placed on the 'modern side,' and practically

abandons the study of the classics altogether. The case of geography is very different. If geography were properly taught, two hours a week should be ample to give such a solid and lasting foundation as would afford an admirable basis on which to superimpose any special studies in that direction which might in the case of particular boys or particular classes be considered desirable. For it must be remembered that our main object is not so much to turn out from our public schools boys who shall be experts in geographical knowledge, as to provide that in no case shall it be possible for a boy to leave a public school without having acquired at least a general working knowledge of the main divisions of the world in which he lives, sufficient to enable him to take an intelligent interest in events in every part of the globe.

Again, from a purely abstract point of view, there is probably no study which, by the common consent of educational authorities of every description (whether their own particular branch be classics or mathematics, modern languages or physics), is so generally admitted to be a necessary concomitant in any scheme of liberal education. Opinions may, and do, differ as to the relative value of many of the studies which are pursued at our great public schools, and as to the exact proportion of time which should in fairness be allotted to each ; but I think it may safely be postulated that the representatives of the most opposite schools of thought would, without any exception, be prepared to admit that geography, *provided it can be properly taught*, should form an integral portion of any educational curriculum, whether its foundation be literary, mathematical, commercial, or purely scientific. If this be so—and I do not think the fact can be reasonably questioned—the value of geography as a purely educational subject is at once apparent ; whilst that value is obviously, for practical purposes, enormously enhanced in England by the fact that there is no country that has vaster commercial relations with every part of the habitable globe. The claims of geography are, indeed, *mutatis mutandis*, very much like those of the celebrated Athenian general, Themistocles. When his colleagues had to assign the rewards of merit after the battle of Salamis, they, without exception, each cast the first vote for himself ; but they each, without exception, cast the second vote for Themistocles. And the real reasons why the study of geography has been so grossly neglected in the past are, first, that it is what the Greeks called a ‘*parergon*,’ and, secondly (though this point is really intimately connected with the first), that there has been no definite or adequate conception on what lines the teaching of geography should proceed. Geography, in other words, has failed to receive adequate treatment in the ordinary educational time-table because, on the one hand, it had no champions, whose first business it might be to see that it was properly recognised and awarded its due place ; and, secondly, because, for the same reason, there was no

geographical expert (as there were experts in classics, mathematics, and other recognised branches of education) to show exactly on what lines the teaching of this subject should proceed or what methods were best calculated to insure its proper appreciation and success. To this point it will be necessary to refer again, but in the meantime there are certain general advantages in the teaching of geography to which it is desirable that I should briefly refer.

In the first place, I think it may fairly be claimed for geography that there is no subject, provided it be properly taught, which can be made more interesting, even to the ignorant and ill-informed, than this. The various divisions of the world's surface are so intimately connected with the development and expansion of mankind that, if it be approached in a proper spirit, there is no branch of study which can equal this in vividness and reality of human interest. We all of us instinctively feel, with Pope, that 'the proper study of mankind is man'; and for the ordinary individual, even if not for the pure scholar, any subject becomes interesting precisely in proportion to the extent that it deals in a vivid and graphic manner with the lives and interests of men and women. And this element of human interest is pre-eminently attached to geography; because the history of mankind is indissolubly connected with the various divisions of the globe. So much is this the case that at the end of any properly conducted system of lectures on geography any intelligent listener would inevitably have acquired a large measure of historical knowledge in addition, and that knowledge would have been impressed on his memory with all the added force and advantage which local associations necessarily give.

But though the human interest necessarily predominates, geography has in the fact that it is so intimately associated with every scene of earthly beauty another great and powerful ally in its capacity to excite and stimulate interest. Mankind, and especially modern mankind, has an instinctive appreciation of beautiful scenery. There is nothing which appeals more to the average eye than this; there is no more powerful incentive to travel, or in the choice of a holiday resort. And if the motives which animate those fortunate individuals who are designated by the somewhat supercilious title of 'globetrotters' could be analysed, it would generally, I think, be found that it was not so much the desire to see 'cities and men' (though this is, of course, a part of the inducement) as the unsatisfied yearning for beautiful scenery, which impelled their wandering footsteps.

But, fortunately, it is no longer necessary to travel to get an almost absolutely perfect conception of the beauties which the most remote and inaccessible portions of the earth contain. Since the introduction and perfection of the magic-lantern it is possible to bring before the eyes of any audience the living counterpart of scenery which may be situated at the other end of the globe. The

magic-lantern, in fact, has solved the question which so many school-masters have anxiously asked themselves, namely, 'How can geography be properly taught?' It supplies that one touch of nature which makes the whole world kin. It provides in the most striking and concrete form that element of human interest without which every study must to the average mind seem dull and disheartening. It imitates as nearly as possible the actual process of travelling, and thus affords that vivid incentive to geographical study which makes almost every traveller a lover of geographical knowledge. That the average public-school boy, when he leaves school, has the haziest knowledge of general geography is, I fear, an undeniable fact; but I think it is equally certain that after (say) ten years' time he will, if he has travelled at all, have acquired a fair working knowledge of the world's surface, though, of course, nothing compared to what his knowledge would have been could he have had a proper foundation in the days of his boyhood. And what is the reason of the improvement? Simply that what in the old days, if it was presented to him at all, was presented as a dull and soulless task has been quickened into life and interest by the power of vitalising association. He has learnt that the places which were to him once mere names actually exist, and are filled with living men and women; he has learnt that the scenes to which he heard vague and at the time unmeaning epithets attached have an actual and a present reality, and are, indeed, instinct with life and beauty. That which the ear failed to convey the eye has in a moment of time taught him. And having acquired this knowledge, having found out that those portions of the globe which he has visited are actually endowed with permanent interest, he has been able to go a step further, and to take an almost equally pleasurable interest in reading or hearing of places which he has never visited. And all this interest and all this pleasure can in a large measure be conveyed by means of the magic-lantern, and they can be conveyed at a minimum cost of time.

The magic-lantern, in fact, does for the study of geography precisely what the illustrated page does for the modern magazine: *it makes it interesting*, and therefore acceptable, to the average individual. It is to this fact that the amazing development of illustrated monthly journalism owes its success. While the circulation of illustrated magazines has increased in the most phenomenal way, the popularity of the older magazines, which were founded before this simple fact became apparent, and which have refused to bow to the new order of things, has in some cases been seriously threatened. From the point of view of good literature this may be deplored; but the result is undeniable, and affords a striking illustration of the interest which scenic representation never fails to impart to the ordinary mind in the case of any branch of human knowledge or human interest. And until this simple truth be comprehended by the head masters of our

public schools—that the sum-total of the philosophy of geographical education lies in the magic-lantern—the teaching of geography will never be anything but perfunctory and elusive. Fortunately, this truth has already been recognised in other quarters, and in some cases it even seems to have been partially endorsed in the case of individual public schools. But, as I shall presently hope to show, to make adequate and intelligent use of the magic-lantern nothing will suffice but a system of the most complete co-operative education, undertaken by our great public schools in common, or at least by individual groups of such schools. For it is a peculiar and noteworthy feature of geography that, owing to the fact that it can best be taught by the aid of the magic-lantern, it can also best be taught to comparatively large audiences—that is to say, in the form of illustrated lectures. There is something curiously sympathetic and inspiring in a large audience. Ask any practical speaker whether he would rather address a small or a large meeting, and his reply will surely invariably be that an empty or half-empty room acts like a wet blanket on his mind. And the inspiration which is derived from a large gathering communicates itself not only to the speaker, but to the audience itself. This is another reason why geography, if it be properly taught (and by properly taught I mean taught with the aid and illustrations of lantern-slides), should really be a peculiarly easy subject for a head master to provide for as part of his curriculum. In the case of most other subjects the difficulty is to make the classes small enough to secure individual tuition; and as it necessarily follows that, the smaller the classes, the greater will be the expense, a head master often has to content himself with classes whose numbers he cannot but recognise are really too large to provide for ideal teaching. But with geography taught by means of the magic-lantern exactly the opposite is the case. Provided that the lecturer be competent—provided, that is to say, that he makes his subject-matter as interesting as any lecture dealing with such a variety of issues can undoubtedly be made in the hands of a fairly able speaker who knows his particular subject—the greater the numbers the better will be the result.

For it is another immense advantage of geography that, if taught in the form of lectures, it need not be taught by what for want of a better name I may term a geographical expert. This is not the case with other studies. It would obviously be absurd to expect any satisfactory classical results in a school where the masters were not themselves competent classics. The same principle applies equally to mathematics, modern languages, natural science, and (though not, perhaps, in so great a degree) to history. But in the case of a lecture on geography all that is necessary is (1) that the lecturer should have personally visited, or at least be intimately acquainted with, the actual country or locality which is the subject-matter of his address, and (2) that he should be a fluent, or at the least a fairly fluent, speaker.

Indeed, this latter quality is so essential that I am not certain that it should not have been placed first ; while though it would, perhaps, not always be necessary, it would be extremely desirable that he should have visited the country on which he has to speak. Indeed, first-hand knowledge of the subject-matter of the lecture is so important that I am not certain that it should not be regarded as a *sine qua non* of geographical teaching. If this be admitted, I may put the matter in a slightly different way by postulating that in the teaching of geography it is not so much a general geographical expert that is required (and, indeed, the services of such an Admirable Crichton would be hard to obtain), but a particular geographical expert so far as the subject-matter of each individual lecture is concerned. I very much doubt whether the 'local colouring' which actual residence in a particular locality or country alone can give can be at all adequately compensated for by any amount of reading, however intelligently directed. And I am quite certain that any effort to impart too much information in the course of such a lecture (which is the kind of error into which one who had not visited the actual locality might easily fall) would be a mistake of a most fatal character. The slides themselves, if they are properly chosen, will give much of the information required ; especially if, as I imagine is not beyond accomplishment, a good map of the country were kept permanently on the screen, to which (in addition to the various slides) the lecturer could, as occasion required, refer. For I repeat the prime consideration must be to make such a lecture interesting, and this must be accomplished even at the expense of encouraging a certain modicum of amusement. This is the plan which politicians, and especially colonial politicians, so often pursue when giving a political address, and it certainly seems to succeed in interesting their audiences. A few months ago I heard one of the leaders of the Dominion Parliament address a large audience in Montreal. He gave from the point of view of his party an able and lucid exposition of Canadian politics ; but in the course of his address he managed to introduce at least a dozen highly ludicrous stories, some of which were, perhaps, a little far-fetched, but all of which at least accomplished the desired result of maintaining the interest of the audience. Similarly, I think the ideal lecturer on geography, especially before a public-school audience, would be one who would not be afraid of combining amusement with instruction.

And, as a matter of fact, it so happens that in the Agents-General for the respective colonies there already exists a body of men who by the very nature of their training and in virtue of their office are ideally qualified for such a task. An agent-general is almost invariably one who has won his way to the front through the storm and stress of colonial political life. He is, therefore, almost necessarily a practised platform speaker, and he naturally possesses an intimate knowledge of the colony which he represents. If some of these gentlemen could

be persuaded to deliver lectures on their respective colonies at our leading public schools, one can hardly imagine how it could be possible to obtain persons more admirably fitted for such a purpose. Nor should the task of persuasion be under the circumstances very difficult. It is one of the main functions of an agent-general's office to use his best endeavours in making the resources and amenities of the colony which he represents known to the largest possible number of the British public. For an agent-general, therefore, to give a lecture before such an audience as is represented by a great public school would be an opportunity in precise correspondence with the duties of his official position; and would be all the more acceptable at the present time, when almost every colony realises the desirability of attracting by all legitimate means the largest possible proportion of British emigration. It must not, however, be thought that I am suggesting that the Agents-General should become official lecturers to the great public schools, though an occasional lecture from any of these gentlemen would certainly prove highly acceptable. I merely desire to indicate the kind of lecture which it is most desirable should be given; for, apart from the official representatives of the colonies, there must be many colonials, either permanently or temporarily resident in England, who would be admirably qualified to give lectures on their individual colonies, and might be not unwilling to have such an opportunity of making their respective merits more widely known.

It is certain that under present conditions ludicrous ignorance of colonial geography, which is often displayed by English writers, even in so simple a matter as in correctly addressing an envelope, causes a good deal of natural irritation amongst the recipients; though I suspect that sometimes colonial ignorance of English geography is very nearly as dense. Still, when a letter is addressed with some such superscription as 'John Jones, Esq., Tasmania, New Zealand,' the thousand miles of geographical error thereby implied not unnaturally causes a certain amount of amused indignation. Such mistakes are not infrequent, and I have myself seen a letter emanating from an official quarter, where it might have been thought that such errors would be carefully guarded against, with an address quite as ludicrously incorrect as the one given above. But, apart altogether from the desirability of not causing unnecessary irritation to the susceptibilities of those who in some cases are somewhat unreasonably prone to take offence, there is the far more practical need of an intimate acquaintance amongst the wealthier commercial classes of England with those portions of the globe which, with their increasing population, are rapidly becoming more and more desirable markets for the British manufacturer and the British merchant. If, from the point of view of a wide and liberal general education, there is no study which is more informing to the mind than geography, it is at least equally true that, from a practical point of view, there is no study which is more eminently

necessary for the proper training of a commercial nation. Geography, as I have endeavoured to show, has many claims for a more extended recognition ; but of its many merits, there is hardly any more obvious than this—that in a peculiar and unique degree it combines the advantages of a study admirably fitted to expand and enlarge the mind with the everyday requirements of a practical age.

It now remains that I should endeavour to indicate a working scheme which, I venture to think, might, with a few slight modifications, be successfully applied to most of our great public schools ; but before I attempt that task there is one other point in connection with the abstract side of the case on which I should briefly wish to touch.

I have already emphasised the desirability of every public-school boy acquiring at least a working knowledge of the main divisions of the earth's surface. The chief countries of the world and their respective centres of population should at least be as familiar to any boy at the close of his public-school career as a knowledge of, say, the ordinary rules of Latin grammar or the simpler mathematical exercises. But there is another phase of geographical teaching which, so far as I am aware, has been almost totally neglected at our public schools, but which is really deserving of special attention, for it contains the germ of an attractive study. I refer to the desirability of inculcating in every school an exact and accurate knowledge of the immediate neighbourhood by which it is surrounded.

I never knew how attractive this minute specialisation could be made until, having acquired property in one of the colonies, I began to study the chart of the district. To be able to accurately delineate the immediate neighbourhood in which one lives is of immense practical advantage ; and it is a habit which is not only easily acquired, but which, when acquired, imparts a new interest to one's surroundings, especially if a due knowledge of the points of the compass is made an integral part of such a study.

I may now revert to the working scheme to which I have just alluded. The great essential, to my mind, is that there should be co-operation between a group of, say, six public schools, so that the same lecture should be delivered at each, in order to secure the best-available talent at a minimum of expense. In this there should be no great difficulty, if once a definite system were pre-arranged. As I have already suggested, it should be comparatively easy to secure the services of quite a number of persons who would not only be willing, but in every way competent, to give most interesting lectures on the various divisions of our colonial empire.

It would merely require a certain amount of organisation to arrange for a series of such lectures to take place in any one particular term at a given school or group of schools ; while as regards the geography of Europe, there must be in every public school a set of the assistant masters who would be admirably qualified, with any further training,

to lecture on almost every country of the Continent, including Italy and Greece. Moreover, if such a system were once established, and the principle of co-operative interchange of lecturers arranged, it would be by no means difficult to get suitable persons to visit in their holidays such countries as it might be desired to include in the regular curriculum.

If I may pass for a moment to the consideration of details, the ideal plan would seem to be for five or six of the great public schools to combine together for the purpose of sharing the advantages of the lectures, which should, of course, without exception, be illustrated by lantern-slides, and be delivered for an hour on one fixed evening of the week, each school agreeing to take one particular evening throughout the term. Moreover, during the course of the following week each member of a co-operating school should be required, as part of an evening's preparation, to study on the map the particular country of the preceding lecture, and be required on the morning following that preparation (a) to fill in on an outline map the chief towns, rivers, and other leading geographical features of the country, and (b) to draw from memory an outline map of the same. These maps should be marked as part of the regular school course; while a brief *résumé* of the previous lecture, in the form of a short essay to be written in school, might also be required. An hour should be amply sufficient to cover the whole of this work, excepting the time required for preparation; so that the actual hours weekly given to geography would only be two, which surely cannot be considered an excessive demand on the time-table, especially when it is remembered that one of those hours (namely, that occupied by the lecture) could hardly be classified as actual work, however valuable its effects might be.

Without in any way attempting to prescribe a hard-and-fast plan, I may briefly indicate the length of time which a course of geography lectures might be arranged to take, and the kind of classification which it would probably be found desirable to make. Most of our great public schools have an academic year consisting of three terms; and there is hardly any boy, however brief his school career may be, who does not stay at least that length of time, while the average limit is probably from four to five years, and in some schools even longer.

A two years' course would, therefore, include every boy; and if the same kind of course were repeated every two years, with different lecturers, and therefore a correspondingly different treatment, sufficient variety would be afforded to prevent any feeling of monotony arising from undue repetition of the subject. This, however, is in any case a mere matter of detail, for there would be nothing to prevent a course being extended to four or even six years. Merely, therefore, by way of illustrating the general principle, I will suppose that a two years' course should be adopted, during which, at each of the co-operating schools, one illustrated lecture should be delivered during each week

on some particular country or division of the world. To make these lectures provide the maximum of usefulness it would clearly be desirable that some definite plan should be pursued, and that during each term, so far as possible, some main division of the earth's surface should be treated in detail. On such a plan the great colonial units might first be dealt with, while together with them might be joined those countries with which by geographical position they were specially connected. Thus, in the first year the first term might be devoted to Australia and New Zealand (with the addition of New Guinea and the South Sea Islands), and the individual lectures be divided as follows, namely, one to the discovery and settlement of Australia; one to each of the six Australian States; one to New Zealand; one to New Guinea, and one to the South Sea Islands.

The second term might be particularly devoted to Canada, giving, however, two lectures to the United States and one to South America. The third might be given especially to the South African colonies, including, however, the whole of Africa, and in particular assigning one or two lectures to Egypt and the Nile.

The first term of the second year might be devoted to Europe, and the second to Asia; while the third term (completing the course) might be assigned to special subjects, such as industries of the British Isles, Palestine, Athens, &c.

A course of ten lectures in each term would probably be found sufficient for the general purposes of the above scheme, while on any vacant days special subjects might be arranged; *e.g.*, during the first term a lecture on the 'Industries of Australia,' 'Sheep Farming in Australia,' 'Tropical Industries of Australia,' or the like, might be added to the curriculum.

From the following table the details of the plan suggested will be seen at a glance:

FIRST YEAR

SUBJECTS OF LECTURES

First Term	Second Term	Third Term
1. Australia (mainly historical, with large map).	1. Canada (historical, with large map).	1. Northern Africa (with large map, historical).
2. New South Wales.	2. Maritime Provinces.	2. S. Africa (with large map, historical).
3. Victoria.	3. Quebec.	3. Cape Colony.
4. South Australia.	4. Ontario.	4. Natal.
5. West Australia.	5. Manitoba.	5. Orange River Colony.
6. Queensland.	6. N.-W. Territory and Yukon.	6. Transvaal.
7. Tasmania.	7. British Columbia.	7. Rhodesia.
8. New Zealand.	8. United States.	8. Egypt and the Nile.
9. New Guinea.	9. United States.	9. German Africa and the Congo State.
10. South Sea Islands.	10. South America.	10. Stanley's and Livingstone's Travels.

SECOND YEAR

SUBJECTS OF LECTURES

First Term	Second Term	Third Term
1. Europe (with large map, historical).	1. Asia (with large map, historical).	The British Isles, with special lectures on British industries, scenery, cathedrals, universities, &c. (For this might be substituted alternate courses on other special subjects, so as to introduce the above course once in four or six years.)
2. France and Belgium.	2. India.	
3. German Empire and Holland.	3. Indian Mutiny.	
4. Spain and Portugal.	4. Arabia.	
5. Austria.	5. Afghanistan.	
6. Switzerland.	6. Burma.	
7. Italy.	7. China.	
8. Greece.	8. Japan.	
9. Russia.	9. Siberia.	
10. Norway and Sweden.	10. East Indian Islands.	

The above table is merely given by way of illustration, and as an indication of the kind of scheme which might be evolved after due consideration. Especially in regard to details it is offered merely by way of suggestion. For instance, in the first term's course it might very probably be found advisable to devote *two* lectures to New Zealand and to include New Guinea in the South Sea Islands.

Again, the West Indies have been omitted altogether, because I have not felt certain whether they should be included in the second term's course or transferred to some other series.

At the same time, to the extent that it gives special prominence to British colonial geography and to the great British self-governing communities, the table has been deliberately framed; and I am strongly of the opinion that, under any scheme of classification, an equally prominent place should be given to our colonial possessions, however much the treatment might vary in detail.

The cost of such a scheme would hardly, I think, be excessive. In a school numbering five hundred pupils the total expenses for each lecture should hardly exceed a shilling a head, and in a good many instances even that sum might, probably, be very considerably reduced.

That our public schools should co-operate for educational purposes is, I admit, a somewhat novel suggestion, and one which the legitimate conservatism of these great institutions might at first be inclined to oppose. But the principle is, after all, not altogether a new one. Head masters already not infrequently interchange pulpits, and the interchange of lecturers is really only the extension of the same principle to a different plane. But even were the proposal altogether a new one, I am radical enough to believe that a new century demands new methods; and even the most strenuous opponents of change will hardly deny that some forward step should be taken in regard to the teaching of this great and important subject. Its neglect in the

past by our leading public schools has been little less than an educational scandal, and the adoption of some system more consonant with the demands of modern education seems a matter of urgent necessity. If I have been somewhat over-bold in suggesting a positive scheme of constructive reform, I may plead by way of excuse that it seemed scarcely fair to offer mere negative criticism; and I can at least offer this defence for my own proposals—that they have been evolved after mature deliberation and are the result of a somewhat extended knowledge of the great divisions of the Empire. Our public schools are entrusted with the highest educational interests of the country, and it is time that they should make proper and systematic provision for one of the most useful and instructive of all branches of human knowledge.

R. E. MACNAGHTEN.

McGill University.

THE PROBLEM OF EARTHQUAKES

To the man in the street an earthquake is like a thunderstorm, tornado, or volcanic eruption, merely an incomprehensible and disastrous convulsion of nature. To the scientist it is caused by a settlement in the earth's crust, due to the shrinkage of a cooling planet, and he points, in support of his view, to the many 'faults' in the rocks—a geological term for vertical breaks in the continuity of horizontal strata, one or other side of which has been raised or depressed. •

When earthquakes happen in some remote districts of Italy or Japan they are soon forgotten ; but now that two of the most flourishing towns on the Pacific seaboard of America, whose names are household words, have been stricken, incidentally sweeping away millions sterling of the reserves of our most enterprising insurance companies, an inquiry into the cause of such sudden and appalling catastrophes may be of interest, even though our own dwellings in England are practically outside of any present earthquake zone.

The bald statement that earthquakes are due to the shrinkage of a cooling planet is not an entirely satisfying explanation, for it does not fit with or explain any of the peculiarities of their manifestations, whilst the formation of geological faults may be infinitely gradual and wholly unaccompanied by shocks. Mountain chains rise slowly to attain vast altitudes, or sink again to lower levels ; coast-lines and islands rise or become submerged ; volcanic vents are upraised and become active or dormant : all these movements taking place in proximity to the sea. This unrest along certain lines whilst the vast interiors of continents remain undisturbed scarcely suggests the kind of general corrugating and depressing action which would accompany a general secular shrinkage. What it does suggest is that there must be imprisoned underground forces at work along lines of least resistance.

What these forces are, and how they are set in movement, are questions of the highest importance, and these we shall attempt to solve.

The solid crust of the earth has been the subject of examination since geology became a science. It is composed of sedimentary strata deposited under water, their composition varying with the depth of water, proximity of land, the geological epoch, and the

subsequent pressure and heat, infiltration, &c., they have been exposed to. They comprise sandstones, limestones, clays, slates, shales, marls, grits and conglomerates, of every quality and degree of hardness. In other regions the rocks are crystalline, having been originally molten, called Plutonic, as granite, porphyry, serpentine, basalt, &c.; or originally sedimentary rocks, but rendered crystalline by intense heat and pressure of superincumbent strata since removed, as the gneisses, marbles, &c., called Metamorphic. The earth's crust is thus composed of heterogeneous elements; but all possess one important property—flexibility, though in varying degrees. Alike in very moderate elevations and in lofty mountain chains, the rocks are seen to have been thrown into arches and troughs and even to have been crumpled and folded like sheets of paper, or dislocated or broken up by the enormous strains and stresses they have been subjected to. These are the strikes, dips, synclinals and anticlinals, faults, folds, upthrows and downthrows of geologists, modest examples of which can be seen anywhere in cliffs and even in quarries and railway cuttings.

Of the conditions prevailing beneath the crust we know far less. When pits are sunk the temperature increases at a progressive rate with the depth, boiling springs are encountered, some making their way to the surface, red-hot stones and ash and molten rock are violently extruded through vents, but most significant of all to the geologist is the metamorphism of rocks, which must have been melted at relatively moderate depths, but are now exposed on the surface in every quarter of the globe. There is thus the certainty that the cooled surface is underlain at some not altogether inaccessible depth by rock in a molten state, both fluid and pasty, through heat. Below this is the intensely heated solid sphere, to which astronomers assign the rigidity and density of steel, and which is kept solid by compression of the external layers. Between the superheated nucleus, kept solid by compression, and the cool enveloping shell in which lies the compressing force, some intermediate condition must exist. With lessening pressure nearer the surface normal conditions must prevail, and rocks at their melting temperature must be in the liquid state of slag from a smelting furnace.

Our globe would therefore consist of an outer cooled heterogeneous and flexible crust, with a temperature increasing downwards, and passing into rocks at and above the melting point in a liquid state, which in turn overlie the heated nucleus, kept solid by compression and of the rigidity of steel.

If the crust were undisturbed, the molten layer upon which it rests would be inactive; but atmospheric agencies, frost and rain, are ceaselessly at work transporting weight from the hills and depositing it under the sea, decreasing the pressure here and adding to it there. The rivers debouch into the sea charged with silt, which is eventually deposited outside the influence of the surf; and the breakers acting

like a rasp along the base of the cliffs contribute their quota of sediment, eroding and breaking up the coast, the material being carried out by the waves to swell the deposits forming parallel to the shore within the littoral zone. Geology reveals that these deposits may in time reach thousands of feet in thickness. Simultaneously the removal of weight by the breakers impairs the resisting power of the crust along the actual sea margin. Thus two parallel lines are continually forming, the one of increasing pressure and the other of decreasing resistance.

Is the crust so flexible as to be sensible to such readjustments of weight? In a past age when perhaps man was already among its inhabitants, the earth suffered in places from a glacial period when vast ice caps formed over the elevated regions. Under one of these accumulations the whole of Wales sank beneath the sea level, rising again to its existing height as the ice melted away. In hotter regions masses of coral are forming reefs and atolls rising in some cases from water hundreds of fathoms deep. The polypes forming the coral can only live in surf near the surface, and unless subsidence had continuously kept pace with deposition no such masses could have been formed. Many of the great rivers empty into bays sheltered from coast currents and there form deltas which have been proved by borings to be thousands of feet thick, yet each foot has been formed in water a few feet deep, as proved by the angle of bedding, the fauna, drifted land debris, and the sorting action of the waves. In all these cases the crust must have sagged under the increasing load of added material, and, did it not similarly give way under the additions of weight along the littoral zone, every island and continent would be surrounded for miles by shoals no deeper than the disturbing motion of the waves. When the crust sags out to sea, the column of water over it deepens, augmenting the pressure. The pressure acting on the molten layer tends to squeeze it, not seaward where the water is deeper, but towards the shore where a line of least resistance is already prepared by the breakers.

The effect of steadily increasing lateral pressure acting on a long and relatively weak shore line of heterogeneous materials must be extremely complex. The molten matter is able to eat its way upward like a corrosive fluid melting the rocks it successively comes in contact with, until it finds relief in pouring out lava in streams of appalling magnitude. This was the fate of the seaboard of the north-east Atlantic in Tertiary times, remains of these eruptions existing in the masses of basaltic trap rock in Antrim, the Hebrides, Faröes, Iceland, Spitzbergen, and Greenland. But where the superincumbent strata are still thick and massive, and especially where they have been already arched into lines of hills, as, judging by the watershed, must have been the case along the Pacific coast of America, the molten matter would continually and irresistibly force the crust upward, producing a chain

of mountains, volcanic or otherwise, parallel to the coast. Simultaneously, owing to the pressure being lateral, the molten liquid would force itself along existing cleavage planes and lines of bedding of laminated and stratified rocks, for it must not be overlooked that all sedimentary strata upheaved above sea level are bent and strained, dried and shrunk, and infiltrated, everywhere presenting lines of fracture and partings, like masonry on a Cyclopean scale. On these the molten matter, capable of dissolving as well as penetrating, presses with ever-increasing insistence, gathering force perhaps for years, until resistance suddenly yields and the fiery liquid is injected with terrific disruptive force along the lines of bedding. Thus the shocks of earthquake which startle civilisation and destroy opulent cities are produced at uncertain intervals and without warning. On the west coast of America we are witnessing this majestic action in full force to-day, for the mighty Pacific is slowly deepening along its eastern margin, and raising its long shore line into colossal ridges which now form almost continuous chains of mountains.

J. STARKIE GARDNER.

THE SUDERMANN CYCLE

HERMANN SUDERMANN occupies an impregnable position in German literature ; the best critics have acknowledged him as a great literary artist, while the almost unanimous voice of the German people has proclaimed him as worthy to rank with their great dramatists of a hundred years ago. It is a curious fact to observe that, whereas so often in this country what obtains the praise of the critics wins little or no approval from the people, in Germany they are constantly to be found in accord. Since 1889, when Sudermann produced *Die Ehre* at the Lessing Theatre, Berlin, his plays have always drawn large audiences, and these among a people who take the drama seriously, who are content to see their Schiller, Lessing, and Goethe again and again without any sense of weariness, and who probably know their Shakespeare far better than the average Englishman does. I have seen Sudermann performed in small provincial theatres, by excellent companies of actors, to an audience of small shopkeepers, minor officials, and solid matrons, whose appreciation was serious and intelligent, and who evidently found in the problems suggested by the dramatist—problems, be it said, of eternal interest—subjects which they could understand and that interested them. The contrast between an English provincial theatre and a German one is very marked : in Germany every little town has its theatre, in which during the winter season a repertory of excellent plays is given ; there are no long runs, and the actors and actresses receive but modest salaries, yet they are often highly talented players, who perform their parts, however small, with a carefulness and an intelligence which show a real desire to understand the dramatist's meaning. In England our system of 'star' actors and long runs tends probably to carelessness about minor parts, and a certain lack of originality and spontaneity which is impossible when two or three different plays are performed perhaps in a week.

Sudermann's play, *Die Ehre*, was performed at a moment when the German stage was at a somewhat low ebb, when the conventions which so often rule the stage were strong, and great traditions of noble German drama were in danger of being forgotten. To him, and to his contemporary Hauptmann, belong the honour of having restored the drama

to its earlier position as a living force, and probably to-day the German people are more influenced by the stage than any other nation, for they possess what neither England nor France possesses—a vital drama, a drama that deals with real flesh and blood, that, depicting contemporary life (as Sudermann nearly always does), sees below the passing phases of the time and pierces to what is of no age and of no country. It is impossible to compare Sudermann profitably with any contemporary English writer, for with the exception of Mr. G. B. Shaw we have no one who has any real claim to be considered a serious dramatist. Clever as our dramatists undoubtedly are, most of them would probably themselves acknowledge that they have not attempted to deal with the serious problems of life in a serious fashion, and that even when they have depicted contemporary manners and contemporary problems, it has only been from the outside, as in the case of Mr. Pinero and Mr. H. A. Jones. The latter, however, once or twice attempted something far more serious in *Judah* and *The Middleman*, but either he exhausted that vein too quickly or found it an unprofitable one, for he soon abandoned it. One has only to compare Mr. H. A. Jones's series of females with a past (or desirous of having one) with Sudermann's women who have sinned and been punished, to see that a whole world of emotions, beliefs, and ideas separate the two dramatists. With Mr. Shaw the case is different, for he certainly takes his art seriously, but then he is incapable of drawing a character that is alive, with the exception, perhaps, of the truly delightful chauffeur in *Man and Superman*, who is a distinct creation. His men and women are always interesting, often witty; he makes us think, and bids us examine our favourite conventions and shibboleths. He is never dull and often wise, but none of these things makes a great dramatist, unless he can endow his men and women with life. It is with his women that Mr. Shaw fails signally: his *Candida* is a bundle of opinions, interesting enough, but with no blood in her veins, Major Barbara is an incomprehensible set of principles, which yield at the slightest pressure, while Mrs. Warren is a monstrosity, and Vivie a piece of animated wood.

And it is just as a delineator of female character that Sudermann is specially great; his women are far better than his men, and in nearly every play the interest of the action concerns itself with the women rather than with the men. His studies of women are profound, and those of the modern women of intense interest to his own generation; he has given us a series of portraits of women which stands almost alone, although the influence of Ibsen may certainly be traced. His heroines—Magda, Beate in *Es lebe das Leben*, Thea in *Das Blumenboot*—are essentially modern; and although it is true that the problems that face them are those that women of all ages have had to face, their attitude towards them is so utterly different that the problem itself scarce seems the same. His women desire to think for themselves, to act for themselves, to be themselves, even if by so doing they become acquainted with

the terrible facts of life, from a knowledge of which their less thinking sisters are spared; they are, most of them, women of intensity and of intellect, women who when they err know it, and do not gloss over their fault, sometimes indeed, as in the case of the heroine of *Es lebe das Leben*, they regret nothing and acknowledge no wrong.

Yet Sudermann makes us feel everywhere that 'the wages of sin is death'; retribution, in some shape or another, always falls, not necessarily on the most guilty person, yet on someone, and we are conscious throughout his tragedies of a Nemesis that will overtake his protagonists. It is thus that the great dramatists fashioned their tragic plays, and it is in this spirit that Shakespeare gives us a drowned Ophelia and a stifled Desdemona. Even where his heroines commit sins which we can neither approve nor justify, as Raffaela in *Das Blumenboot*, we can understand their so doing, and in many cases we are right in giving them our sympathy, and often we are bound to accord them admiration, for his women possess in a marked degree that courage which is so rare and so beautiful in both sexes: the courage to face facts, to tear off conventions, and to follow the light wheresoever it may lead. It is this courage that makes out of Magda and Beate, both women with a past, noble beings, to whom it is impossible to refuse our respect, and the same courage enables Leonore in *Die Ehre* to abandon the conventions by which she has always been hedged around, and to give herself to the man she loves, who happens to belong to a far lower social rank than her own. But Sudermann's women are not merely courageous and independent-minded—were they that alone they would not command our sympathy so greatly—they are essentially womanly in that one and all desire love with a passionate intensity, and in each case it is the desire to fulfil the deepest need of her nature that brings about conflict, and often tragedy.

The German theatre in London deserves the heartiest thanks of all lovers of the drama for having afforded them an opportunity of studying Sudermann's best plays, which are not nearly so familiar to English people as their greatness deserves. For while we have translations and adaptations without number from the French dramatists, it is but rarely that the works of contemporary German dramatists see the light here. Yet in many ways they would mean more to us than the French plays, for the German mind, naturally, is more akin to ours than the French, and the lack of appreciation that has been shown towards Sudermann and Hauptmann is probably due to the fact that fewer people read German than French, and not to the relative merits of the plays themselves. In the six plays that were presented to an English audience, two—*Morituri* and *Das Blumenboot*—had never before been performed in this country, while three others, *Die Schmetterlingsschlacht*, a comedy, *Das Glück im Winkel* and *Die Ehre*, are only known to a limited circle of English readers of German, as they have not yet been translated.

Die Heimat, entitled in its English dress *Magda*, is familiar to a large number of theatre-goers through the acting of Signora Duse and Mrs. Patrick Campbell; the magnificent impersonation of the former can never be forgotten by those who had the privilege of seeing it. Mrs. Campbell's reading of the part, though interesting and powerful, rather fails to express the delicacy and refinement of *Magda*, which differentiate her from the many heroines of drama whose case outwardly is the same as her own. The play gives us the conflict between the old and the new, between the father with his patriarchal idea of authority and the modern daughter with her passion to live her own life. The situation is often almost theatrical, but it is redeemed from any tinge of artificiality by the struggle that takes place in *Magda* between her duty to an utterly conventional father, whose code of honour she believes to be entirely false, and her duty to her child, for whose existence she is responsible. Sympathy is never alienated from *Magda*, yet the father with his military training and stern idea of filial duty wins from us, almost unwillingly, a certain measure of respect and great pity: His idols are false idols, nevertheless the shattering of them destroys all that makes life worth living to him. In his home, he says, 'there is no talk about heredity, no arguments concerning individuality, no scandalous gossip, modern ideas have no entrance there; . . . in this house old-fashioned ideas of paternal authority rule, and will rule as long as I live; and am I therefore to be called a tyrant?' And to this narrow-minded but honest martinet has been born a daughter with a nature entirely opposed to his own, an artist to her finger-tips, with all the gifts and all the limitations belonging to this nature. *Magda* is a true child of her father in that she possesses his tenacity and determination, and, given two such characters in close proximity, conflict is bound to arise. *Magda's* faults are those of generous, passionate youth thrown amid adverse circumstances; it is a purely conventional code of honour that bids her marry the man who has so shamefully deserted her in her hour of need, and we are glad that the conditions imposed by him and by her father prevent her from becoming his wife. By thus acting she never became in the eyes of the 'world' (it was only the 'world' of a very narrow-minded, conventional set of people) a 'respectable woman,' but, at any rate, she maintained her self-respect. The love of her child was stronger than any power exercised by the society into which she was born.

The play is full of striking and beautiful scenes, one of the most touching being that between the father and daughter after the former has promised the pastor—who has always loved *Magda*—to ask no questions concerning her past. The famous singer has returned to her native town, after many years' absence, during which she has suffered and experienced much, and finds her old home just as it was. Life has stood still with the inmates of that quiet home; it is a great contrast to her existence, and she is touched by her father's joy in her

return, and the affection given her by her young sister. But she knows, in spite of this, that life would be impossible for her in these narrow surroundings, while her father cannot conceal his anxiety concerning her unknown past; her beauty, her charm, her tenderness towards himself, all inspire him with suspicion. 'Tell me,' he implores her, 'that you have remained pure in body and soul, and then you can go on your own way with my blessing.' Magda's answer gives the keynote of her character. 'I have been true to myself, dear father.' In the scene between Magda and the man who deserted her, dramatic interest reaches its height, and there are few passages in modern literature so poignant and so tragic. He, the mean-spirited, pompous, lying coward, whom chance has brought into the circle of her father's friends, and who has become a highly respectable, pious member of society, is nervous and anxious to meet once again his early love, but to conceal their relations. He expects reproaches: it is Magda's thanks that overwhelm him when, in a speech of unsurpassed passion and vehemence, she tells him what he had meant to her. 'I was a stupid, thoughtless creature, enjoying my liberty like an escaped monkey—through you I became a woman. To whatever height I have reached in my art, for what I am in myself, I have you to thank. My soul was like a silent harp, and through you the storm swept over it; it has sounded almost to breaking the whole scale of emotions which brings us women to maturity—love and hate and revenge and ambition and' (springing up) 'necessity, necessity, necessity—threefold necessity—and the greatest, the strongest, the highest of all—the love of a mother for a child! all that I owe you.'

In *Die Ehre* we are introduced into a lower middle-class family in Berlin, which occupies the back of a house, the front part of which belongs to a very rich manufacturer. The *bourgeois* family, the Heineckes, consists of a father, mother, and two daughters, one of whom is unmarried and beautiful. A son, Robert, has been for years abroad in the employ of the rich manufacturer. He has educated himself, is high-principled, serious-minded, with ideals of womanhood which make him desire to reverence and cherish his mother and sisters. After an absence abroad of many years, during which the memory of home and fatherland has occupied a sacred place in his heart, he returns a rich, prosperous man to Berlin, desirous of helping his family and living happily with them. With a terrible shock he discovers that the years that have passed have put a barrier, strong and impassable, between him and his kindred. They have remained hopelessly sordid in their views; his mother is willing to receive presents from his employer's servants, and favours of a most questionable kind from his employer's son, his sister Alma, young and beautiful, is bent on enjoyment at whatever cost. His emotions on seeing them all again is great; their feeling is surprise at his having a Count as a friend, and anxiety to know how rich he is, and what

he is going to give them. He is conscious at the first meeting that he is out of sympathy with them, though it is some time before he realises in its fulness the life they are leading. Alma's remark, 'One has only one life, and the great thing is to be jolly. Are you jolly, Robert?' surprises him, and rouses an uneasiness in his mind that is only increased as time goes on. His friend, Count Trast, a wealthy coffee merchant, a cosmopolitan and a philosopher who years ago had to leave the army because of large gambling debts, and whom the military code of honour—which he refused to accept—would have condemned to suicide, acts as a mouthpiece for the expression of Sudermann's ideas, and although Sudermann is too good a dramatist to moralise at any great length, it must be confessed that Count Trast's perorations, wise as they are, on ideas of honour are apt to be now and again a little tedious. But he is a sensible adviser to Robert. He tells him he has gone out of his own class and cannot go back. Their ideas are not his ideas, their standards not his. 'Give what is required in the matter of money, give in abundance, but—leave them and come with me.' But to Robert such a course is impossible; he cannot abandon his family, and, above all, his young sister, for whom he has always cherished the deepest affection.

With Count Trast he pays a formal visit to his employer, the manufacturer, Mühlingk, whose son, Kurt, leads a gay, careless life, and regards himself as in every way immeasurably superior to his father's *employé*, Robert Heinecke. 'I cannot introduce my friends, the sons of good families,' he says, 'to a clerk who lives in a back flat' (*Hinterhaus*; in Berlin many of the large houses are divided in this curious way into back and front flats), though, as his sister Lenore quietly reminds him, he has no objection to having the most intimate relations with the clerk's beautiful sister. In Lenore Sudermann has given us one of his finest female characters; in a *milieu* of false ideas and ideals, of conventional codes of honour, with a father who cares for little but money-making, and a brother whose chosen companions are worthless young officers, whose days are passed in idleness and profligacy, while yet in the presence of his parents he maintains a hypocritical attitude of filial obedience, Lenore has grown up pure-minded, self-reliant, and strenuous, a hater of the frivolous society life which her mother is so anxious for her to lead; and although years have passed since she has seen Robert, she has always cared for him, and has therefore, greatly to her parents' vexation, refused many excellent suitors. Count Trast by chance discovers that Kurt Mühlingk is Alma's lover, and Robert, to his horror, learns that his married sister has been allowing her home to be used as a place of rendezvous for the lovers. He reproaches his parents for allowing the girl to go out at night, but the mother will not allow that there was any harm in that, and her one idea of punishment

for her daughter is that she shall now stay at home and do household work, while the father is determined to drive her out of the house to redeem his 'honour.' 'She has brought dishonour on me. I am the master of the house; I know what has to be done. Poor people have their ideas of honour. She has her father's curse.' And when the mother says; 'No, no, not that,' he replies, 'You do not understand the meaning of honour. Honour'—striking his breast—'is here. I will drive her out of house and home.' Such words ring strangely from the lips of a father who has given no protection to a young daughter, and who has been perfectly conscious of the attention bestowed on her by his employer's son. It is a false idea of honour, as false as that of the young man's who sees nothing dishonourable in his relations with Alma, but regards it as shameful to be on terms of social equality with her brother who has been a clerk in his father's employ. To Robert the situation is full of difficulty; he loves his sister, and still believes she is more sinned against than sinning. Shall he force Kurt to marry her, or shall he decide the matter in the conventional fashion by a duel? No, he will take her right away. 'The innocent, child-like soul which he has dragged in the mud he can never restore, and no other satisfaction do I want.' By love and by protection on his part, by repentance and hard work on Alma's, she will in course of time win redemption. But he has made his plans in ignorance of his sister's nature. She is no repentant Magdalen, and she is absolutely unable to understand her brother's point of view. What has she done that she should be treated with such severity? 'I am young and pretty; I want to enjoy myself, and wear nice dresses. I don't want to marry a man in a factory. I want a gentleman, and as to marrying him—well, if I can't do that, I'll——. And Kurt has always been very good to me; I don't want you and your protection. Girls like me don't come to grief.' Robert can do nothing, and when he learns that his parents have joyfully accepted a large sum of money from the betrayer's father, and that Alma is thus absolved from her guilt, he at last recognises that all possibility of intercourse with his family is at an end, and with horror and despair he leaves his home. He determines now to seek satisfaction from Kurt, but his friend points out the folly of this. Whose honour has been smirched? Certainly not his family's, for they, one and all, glory in the fruits of dishonour, and if he is killed in the duel how will that mend matters? 'You are chasing a phantom; no one has tarnished your honour. After all, what is this honour but a mixture of pride, shame, desire to justify oneself? Honour is one thing to you, another to your family, something else to your employer. For nine years you have been living among gentlemen, and now you are demanding from your people a code of honour that does not belong to them. Their honour has been satisfied—with money. It may seem horrible'—in response to an

exclamation of horror from Robert—‘but it is the truth, which, like nature, is often horrible.’ Robert unwillingly agrees to forego satisfaction, and to return to India, but not before he has paid back to his employer the large sum given by him to Alma. He seeks an interview with him, and after making his final settlement with the firm, which he is leaving, his employer bids him farewell. ‘I wish you all good luck in the future. Be a sensible fellow, and don’t forget how much you are indebted to my house.’ To which Robert replies: ‘No, sir, that I shall never forget. Here are the forty thousand marks which you were kind enough to present to my father.’ ‘The money was a gift, not a loan.’ ‘In spite of that I feel myself responsible for paying it back.’ The elder man’s astonishment is great; while the son says with meaning: ‘Do you not think it is very odd, father, that our clerk should have been able to save so much?’ Robert, who has until now restrained himself with great difficulty, rushes on the young man, exclaiming: ‘You scoundrel! Repeat that again.’ He is interrupted by the entrance of Lenore and her mother; and the former, who a short time previously has passionately proclaimed her abhorrence of the life she and her people live, with its morality measured by money and its false and hideous standards of honour, implores her father to offer one word of apology to Robert for the wrong that has been done him. ‘Are you mad?’ says the father; and Robert interposes: ‘Never mind about that. I shall always remember you with gratitude as long as I live. You, and you alone, represent everything that home means. God bless you for all your goodness! And now farewell!’ Lenore casts on one side all the fetters that have bound her, and allows expression to her own soul. She goes up to Robert, and passionately cries out: ‘Do not go away—do not, or, if you must go, take me with you! Do not leave me alone; I shall die cooped up in these walls! You are my home; you have always been. Look, I have put my arms round your neck; you cannot cast me off!’ To her father’s exclamation, ‘Good gracious, what a scandal!’ she replies: ‘My dear father, we will not quarrel. I have always loved this man. In exchange for what you have taken from him I offer him as compensation all that I have’—looking towards Robert: ‘I have nothing but myself to offer, but if he will have that——’

Die Ehre is a problem play in the sense that all great plays—*Hamlet*, *Lear*, *The Trojan Women*—are such, in so far as they deal with the complexities of life and character which to the thoughtful person must always present problems, many of which seem to be insoluble. It is a realistic play, and deals with much that is sordid and even repulsive, but the final impression left on the spectator’s mind is not a disagreeable one. Robert springs from a class which, in its struggle for daily bread, loses all self-respect, yet he has kept his alive and sensitive; Lenore, belonging to a higher social grade,

sees around her nothing but the worship of mammon and 'respectability.' She is supposed to know nothing and to see nothing. She must not refer to her brother's ill-doing, for that would be unmaidenly, but it is impossible for her to keep silent. She belongs to another world from that in which she has lived, and we feel as we take leave of her that Robert and she are well mated. Sudermann holds a brief for no class; he attacks hypocrisies and conventional morality whenever he finds them, and he finds them everywhere—in the army, in the upper classes, among the *bourgeois*.

In *Das Glück im Winkel*, produced in 1896, three years after *Heimat*, Sudermann has dealt with a far simpler subject. The action takes place at the end of the nineteenth century in a small town in North Germany, a district well known to the author. The three principal characters in the play are Herr Wiedemann, a schoolmaster (the kind depicted with such a loving hand by that master of the prose idyll, J. P. Richter), his wife Elisabeth, and a nobleman, Von Röcknitz. The schoolmaster is a widower with three children when he weds the gentle and timid orphan girl, and brings her to a peaceful, sheltered home, where she lives, if not joyously, at least contentedly, and gives great happiness to husband and children, to whom she is, in everything but name, a mother. It is a charming picture of a happy, rightly directed life—a husband respected by his colleagues and pupils, looked up to and admired by his wife, a wife tenderly cherished by a devoted husband; happy children, kindly friends. Is this the stuff of which tragedy is made? It is the glory of Sudermann that he has found in seemingly commonplace lives and situations material for the most tragic emotions. There is little in the play, but what there is is extraordinarily dramatic and intense. To the quiet home, protected from storms and violence, passion comes in the shape of Von Röcknitz, the type of the *Übermensch* who will have everything from life that he desires. There is no right or wrong to him beyond the satisfaction of his wants. Long before Elisabeth has married the schoolmaster he has pressed his attentions upon her, and it was really to escape from his passion, which has aroused a corresponding passion in her own heart, that she has accepted the love and protection of her husband. She is not in love with her husband, but she is intensely grateful to him, for the man she loves is married. And Catherine had a sensitive conscience. Only in the shelter of married life can she find refuge from her own desires, and, as time goes on, a certain measure of happiness in the knowledge that she is giving happiness to those around her. She has banished, as she thinks, love from her life, and in its place put duty. But love is not so quickly overcome, and when Von Röcknitz unexpectedly appears in her home she knows that it has been stifled but never killed. All the passionate love for which she has been yearning, all the warmth and glow which have been denied her in her peaceful

married life, rise up and demand satisfaction. She avoids her lover, she battles against herself, she is torn between her passionate feeling for the man she loves and her desire to act loyally towards the man who loves her, and who has been so immeasurably good to her. There is a wonderful scene between her and Von Röcknitz, in which he implores her not to send him away. She is everything to him; his own life is miserable. He is married to an uncongenial wife. May he not have the consolation of her love? Elisabeth feels that it is an unequal fight when both combatants really desire the same thing, and she knows she cannot struggle any longer. But to a woman of Catherine's temperament unlawful love, although it might give the most exquisite joy for a time, could never mean long-lived happiness, for she possessed not only an intense capacity for passionate love, but, unfortunately for her own peace of mind, great sensitiveness. Loving as she does (and she acknowledges it), she believes that life henceforward is impossible, and she determines to drown herself. Better that than other things that might happen. And so she makes all her last arrangements, and quietly lets herself out of the house at night, but her husband prevents her. He has known all from the beginning; there is little need for Catherine to make confession. He understands, but he wants her and needs her; she is dearer than all else besides to him. And the play ends with Catherine's taking up the threads of her daily life once again; henceforth she is at peace. Critics have objected to the end as unconvincing, that a woman like Catherine could not possibly pass her days thus: she was too young to have foregone passion and joy, and that the ending is merely conventional. But is it really so? Are there not some natures that, having once rejected passionate love, no matter for what reason, never desire it again? And to a nature like Catherine's, that had given its intensest love to one who could never gratify it, peace, and tenderness, and security would be all it demanded from life. Readers of Mark Rutherford will recall a somewhat similar situation in *Miriam's Schooling*, where Miriam, storm-tossed by passion which could not be honourably gratified, accepts with thankfulness the affection of the kindly basket-maker in the quiet little country town. To some passion comes once, and once only, and if it is impossible of indulgence they ask nothing more from life but peace after storm. Such was Sudermann's heroine.

Schmetterlingschlacht (The Butterflies' Battle), so-called because the heroine paints butterflies on fans as a means of livelihood, is described as a comedy, but the description is scarcely suitable. It is a sordid play, and does not show Sudermann at his best, although, as in all his work, the characterisation is excellent, and the dialogue is light and often amusing. It deals with the middle class, and is chiefly concerned with the struggles of a very poor widow—her husband has been an inspector of taxes—to bring up her three beautiful

daughters so that they shall secure good marriages. For this purpose she schemes, and cheats, and deceives, and when she is discovered she boldly justifies her actions. What right has the rich manufacturer, who has never known hunger or poverty, to reproach her, a woman alone, who was left penniless, to struggle as best she could for her three children? 'Am I ashamed,' she says, 'at all this deception? No, I can no longer feel any shame. I have had too great a struggle with poverty. Do you know what a pound of meat costs? Do you know what a pound of margarine costs? It costs a good bit, I can tell you; and one gets six marks for a dozen fans. It takes a lot to keep the girls in food and clothes, I can tell you.' Into her mouth Sudermann puts a bold indictment of the modern social and economic system that places a woman in such a position, and it is indeed difficult for those who have lived in ease and comfort to cast a stone at the widow. Her two elder daughters spend their lives in pursuit of the male, while the youngest, a delightful girl, works early and late at her butterflies to keep the family. She acts, at first unconsciously, as a go-between in an intrigue between her eldest sister and one of her employer's clerks, and when later on this *liaison* is likely to cause a rupture between this sister and a very rich prospective bridegroom, it is put down to Rosie's account. But, as is right in a comedy, innocence wins in the end, and the play closes with wedding bells.

Sudermann has here painted his female characters in unsparing colours. He is in this play too much the satirist to do justice to comedy, and the picture he presents to us, though no doubt a true one, is ugly and hardly suitable for light treatment; yet not altogether ugly, for it is redeemed by the figure of Rosie.

Morituri consists of three very short plays, each dealing with the effect of the approach of death on character. In *Teja*, the dramatist has found an historical subject. His hero is the last king of the Ostrogoths, whose host has dwindled to a few starving men. The enemy is close, and treachery has delivered his long-expected fleet laden with provisions into their hands. Shall he and his best be starved into submission, or, like brave warriors, lose their lives on the field of battle? His own heroic courage inspires his hunger-stricken followers, and death in battle is decided upon. But the women must not know lest they should hold them back. The king has been wedded that morning, but no woman's influence has come near him. He is a soldier and a king, and a whole nation is about to die. His thoughts are all on this as in the evening before the battle he sits alone in his tent. It is not death that fills him, with melancholy—he is too brave a man to care for that—but the thought of the downfall of a great people. And to him comes his newly-wedded wife, and with ineffable sweetness and womanly submission she bends over him, offering him fruit and drink. For the first time in his life

he is affected by the presence of a woman, and the scene which takes place between them—he on the verge of death and knowing his wife to be unaware of this, she filled with love and compassion—is full of beauty.

Teja kneels by his wife.

‘Thou art beautiful! I never knew my mother.’

‘Never knew her?’

‘I have never had a sister—nobody ever—. I have never known the meaning of joy in my whole life. Now at the last moment I am learning to know it.’

‘Why at the last moment?’

‘Do not ask why. Eat, I pray thee. Take a piece of mine.’

‘They drink together.’

‘Who art thou, and why dost thou come hither? What dost thou want of me?’

‘I want to love thee.’

‘Thou—oh, my wife!’ They embrace; then softly: ‘And couldst thou not kiss me?’

She shakes her head confusedly.

‘Why not? Tell me why not.’

‘I will whisper it in thine ear.’

‘Well?’

‘Thy beard has milk upon it!’ And the mighty warrior who has never laughed bursts into roars of laughter and kisses her.

The king is interrupted by his henchman, who comes with news of the morrow’s arrangements; but before going to take command he has a last interview with his wife. He stands before her and takes her head in his hands.

‘I feel as if in this hour we were wandering hand-in-hand through a whole world of joy and sorrow. It vanishes, everything vanishes; I am once more what I was—no, no, never that again! But thou, my queen, be thou the bravest among all women; wilt thou?’

‘What dost thou demand of me?’

‘Thou wilt not entreat and cry?’

‘No, my lord.’

‘The moment approaches; we are face to face with death.’

‘I do not mind. No one can attack us until the ships come—’

‘The ships will never come.’ (She is overwhelmed.) ‘But we men are going out to fight.’

‘Thou canst not do that; that is impossible.’

‘We must. Thou art the queen, and dost thou not see that we must?’

‘Yes, I do see.’

‘The king fights in the first rank, and we shall never see each other alive. Dost thou understand that?’

‘Yes, I understand.’

They look at each other silently.

‘Give me thy blessing.’

He falls on his knees before her, puts her hand on his head; she bends trembling towards him and kisses him on his forehead. Such a scene is surely Greek in its intensity, in its tragedy, and in its restraint.

Fritzchen, the second of the three plays, deals with that favourite subject of German novelists and dramatists—military honour. The hero who gives his name to the play is a young lieutenant who has had a *liaison* with a married woman; her husband has horsewhipped him in the public street, and he has not at once answered the insult with his sword. A court of honour is held to consider the case; how can the young man avenge his outraged honour, by suicide or by a duel? The latter is infinitely to be preferred, but as his antagonist is not in the army it is doubtful whether the military code of honour would permit a duel. Pending the decision *Fritzchen* goes to take leave of his parents and of his cousin, to whom he is devotedly attached. The interest of the play is largely psychological, and dramatic irony heightens the pathos of the situation. His mother is overcome with joy at seeing him quite unexpectedly, and the father presses him to take some wine. ‘Don’t worry him,’ says the mother, ‘remember he is going away directly.’ ‘Yes,’ replies *Fritzchen*, ‘I am going away directly.’ Alone with his son, the father rallies the boy on his love affairs, and hints that he knows all about his entanglement. In a light chaffing tone he tells him he will cure him of his troubles, and the boy says perhaps he would if there were time, but ‘In twenty-four hours I am a dead man,’ and then he tells his father the whole story. The father storms and rages, tells him he has dishonoured his name, but to the son, in the near presence of death, these reproaches sound vain and empty. Is not his father to blame? did he not bid him sow his ‘wild oats’? and when just before joining the army he had desired to become engaged to his cousin had not his father said, ‘Gain first of all experience of life, do what your father and grandfather did’? ‘I had not the least desire for such experience. . . I saw in every woman a holy being. Such an attitude may have been very foolish and young, but oh, if you had only left me this—I should still have loved *Agnes*.’ The father feels the reproach to be only too true, and is overwhelmed with remorse; their conversation is interrupted by the arrival of *Fritz*’s brother officer, who informs him that the court of honour has decided in favour of a duel.

‘Thank God!’ exclaim both father and son.

The last scene is short but poignant; the mother, unconscious of her only and beloved child’s approaching death, is playful and gay; she is delighted to see her son’s friend, and only regrets that duty compels them both to go away so soon.

‘My dear boy, you will get leave of absence again soon, won’t you?’

‘Oh yes, of course, dearest mother; after the manœuvres we’ll get leave, and then we’ll all have a jolly time together.’

The father softly whispers to Agnes, who loves Fritzchen, ‘Say good-bye to him, you will never see him again.’ (We are informed in the play that the opponent is a dead shot.)

‘Dear Ag—’ (Fritz looks at her straight in the face, and understands that she knows, then very earnestly, and softly), ‘farewell!’

‘Farewell, Fritz!’

‘I love thee!’

‘I shall always love thee!’

And he goes out to meet his death, wantonly sacrificed to a false code of honour, the power of which it is difficult for English readers to understand. No word of censure is spoken by the father for the act that leads to the insult; it is the insult, publicly given to an officer, that can only be wiped out by death. The characters of the father and the son, given with a few strong strokes, stand out with lifelike distinctness; the girl, who appears only for a few minutes, and says very little, is alive to her finger-tips, and is a true sister to Lenore in *Die Ehre* and Beate in *Es lebe das Leben* in her power of love and self-control.

The last play of the series *Das Blumenboot*, which is, I believe, Sudermann’s last work, needs to be read to be understood and appreciated at its right value. We are introduced into fashionable, idle, pleasure-loving Berlin society of the present day. The Baroness Efflingen, after many ‘gallant’ adventures, has settled down with her second husband, a member of the aristocracy, and a worthless creature who spends most of his time at the gaming tables; there are two daughters by the first marriage, one of whom is married to a man belonging to the middle class, who carries on the great commercial business of his wife’s grandfather. His mother-in-law hates him for his seriousness and hard work, which are a continual reproach to her, and the baron regards him with contempt as a man ‘who washes his hands with soap at a penny a cake.’ He, in return, despises the idle life led by his wife’s relatives, and although at his chief’s desire he resides in the family mansion, he mixes little in the society which gathers there, but he adores his wife Raffaella. The scene in which Raffaella, who is to order her life to such tragic ends, is introduced, strikes the keynote of the play. She is described as dreamy, dark-eyed, shrinking, and in the short conversations with her mother, husband, and sister, her character is revealed as that of a very loving, weak woman, who craves for manifestations of love from a husband who by nature and circumstances is unable to respond. He scarcely understands her, and he is overburdened with the worries of a vast commercial undertaking, and is obliged to be much away from home.

The daughter of a pleasure-loving mother, the young wife allows her emotions, her ultra-sentimentality to get the better of her; she is young, very beautiful, and hungering for a passionate love, and in the society in which she moves—rich, idle, profligate—it is but natural that a lover should appear. He is a renowned traveller, and, like Von Röcknitz in *Das Glück im Winkel*, he fascinates and compels the love of all women he meets; he is ever in the background, hovering as a kind of Damocles's sword, and casting an atmosphere of suppressed excitement over the play. The young wife resists him for a long time, but fate seems to work against her; her husband, in spite of her entreaty that she may go away with him, leaves her with her mother while he goes off on business; her mother invites the renowned traveller to her parties, and so throws them together, while her younger sister, Thea, almost forces her into the arms of her lover with the idea that by so doing she is helping her sister to develop her personality! No wonder she falls an easy prey, and yet we feel throughout the play that she spoke the truth when she said she adored her husband: such women require protection and caresses, and are not content with the knowledge that their husbands love them. The sister Thea, a girl of nineteen, is emphatically a child of her age; young though she is, in feelings she is a mature woman; she is without a sense of either religion or duty, she is desirous of knowing all and experiencing all. She laughs at the idea that because she is unmarried and a young girl she must know nothing: one must be oneself at whatever cost. She is a keen observer of those around her; she sees through her mother's elegant pretences, she divines her sister's secret inclinations, she analyses her own feelings with a hideous clearness. She has no illusions: 'Girls like us cannot love with all our being, our hearts are too much given over to enjoyment for that—we cannot feel deeply—I feel that every time a man wants to marry me—a noble, true man like the Count—I can't love him; a good comrade like Fred, that's another matter—but love for a lifetime——!'

She thinks she understands herself through and through, but she is really unconscious of how much she loves her cousin Fred; when she marries him she makes a compact with him that each shall be entirely free and untrammelled, she will lead her life, he his. With such a philosophy it is not-surprising that after a few months she finds her marriage unhappy, and out of sheer desire for excitement, and to pique her husband, she encourages the Count who had desired her formerly as his wife. She is but playing with fire, and when she recognises that to the Count it is life or death, she draws back almost conscience-stricken; she perceives the poor part she is playing when she comes face to face with reality. 'I can only act—to myself—to you—to others. Perhaps there is something real in me, but it has never been awakened, and you cannot awaken it; you least of all, for you haven't a glimmer of what I really am like.' When her husband,

stirred by jealousy, demands an explanation of her meeting with the Count, she reminds him of their compact. He has nothing to complain of; she has never interfered with his liberty, he has no right to interfere with hers. Yet though she speaks thus proudly, she knows that it is her doing that has made a shipwreck of their married life, for, oddly enough, Fred has never desired this compact, and is genuinely anxious to put away the follies of his unmarried days.

The last scene takes place at midnight, after a gay water fête at the baroness's country house; Raffaella (whose husband is still away) has arranged to go on the lake at midnight with her lover. Unexpectedly her husband returns and some careless words of Fred arouse his suspicion; he believes in his wife, yet he cannot forget she is the daughter of her mother (and he alone knows what that mother's life has been). He questions his mother-in-law, who treats his suspicions with contempt; he belongs to a section of society, she says, that cannot understand a woman like Raffaella, and she advises him to dismiss the matter from his mind. He determines to take his wife away: 'I will save her from all this—that is, if it is not too late—if you have not yet—'

But, alas! it is too late; Raffaella tells her sister she must keep her midnight appointment, and Thea, doubtful as to the depth of her sister's feeling, questions her on the subject.

'You do really love him with that unspeakable, immeasurable love that some few beings feel? Do you really feel he is your fate, so that you do not mind if Leopold knows it, or if Leopold kills you?'

'Ah, at this moment all is of supreme indifference to me—except my love.'

'Then go; then throw yourself into his arms; then—no, do not go yet, not yet; and he, does he love you in the same way? Tell me.'

Raffaella is fain to confess that her lover is spoiled and petted by many women; and she cannot expect such love from him. Her sister begs her not to go.

'You are throwing yourself away, you are making yourself cheap—'

'And supposing he is unfaithful to me, what then?'

'Oh, Ela!'

'Do you know what that means to me? My blood is on fire; if he were to forsake me I should die, or if I didn't die then I should go to anybody. I am like a prostitute, who wants me can have me.'

'Oh, Ela, Ela!'

'Do you remember how I said to you "Don't drive me to this! I love Leopold, I depend on him, I need his protection. But you, you urged me on, you and mama; and now, now, when I am beyond my own self-control you would like all to go quite smoothly, nothing is to happen; you say "Stay quietly here." Oh, no, no; my lover is waiting for me! Good-bye!'

The tragedy that follows is inevitable: husband and lover meet, and the latter is struck down. And the younger sister recognises she has been the chief instrument in bringing it about. 'Who is guilty?' she says in reply to her husband's question. 'I will tell you. She begged and prayed—"Don't drive me to it!" but I gave her no quarter. I urged and bothered her, made opportunity, I carried letters, and to good purpose. I am guilty. I—I—I'"(and, turning to her mother); 'but who made us like this, whoever taught us life was a worthy thing, who drove the feeling of duty out of our hearts, who laughed us out of it, who strewed flowers for ever in our path?'

It is impossible to deal adequately with Sudermann's dramatic work within the narrow limit of a Review article, but, slight as the above descriptions are, they will have fulfilled their purpose if they send readers to the plays of the greatest living dramatist, a writer who by his wide range of subjects, his depth of insight, his emotional sympathy, his power to draw real, living human beings, added to the highest dramatic gifts, should appeal to as large a circle of readers in this country as in Germany, where he ranks with the immortals. *

FLORENCE B. LOW.

THE CLERICAL CONSPIRACY

BEFORE the House of Lords proceeds to deal with the Education Bill in Committee, it may be useful, as well as opportune, to expose the true character and aims of the party from which the attack upon it has chiefly come. There is abundant material for this purpose in the Minutes of Evidence given before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. This evidence is extremely interesting, and much of it is most amusing. Unlike the dry and colourless Report of the Commissioners, where almost everything is sacrificed to unanimity, the evidence teems with personal opinion, not to say personal prejudice, and many of the questions put throw more light than the Report throws upon the various leanings of the Commissioners themselves. Lord St. Aldwyn showed as chairman an impartiality which ought to be judicial, and was so absolute that it betrayed no bias even in favour of the law. The Archbishop of Canterbury cross-examined the witnesses of the Church Association with the severity of a criminal lawyer, and convicted them all, except Lady Wimborne, whose accuracy was marvellous, of slight, insignificant errors in detail. The Bishop of Oxford 'held a brief' for the Ritualists, and defended them with an ingenuity too palpably sophistical to be really effective. The one Commissioner who represented the Protestant cause with real ability and learning, the Reverend Thomas Wortley Drury, is the head of a theological training college at Cambridge, and against Mr. Drury's encyclopædic knowledge the fallacies of Ritualism were powerless. If it were possible to persuade the public that a Blue-book in four volumes was far better reading than most novels, the general reader would take especial delight in Sir Lewis Dibdin's masterly examination of Canon Maccoll. The Dean of the Arches is, of course, a trained lawyer, and an ecclesiastical specialist. But there are few lawyers, and still fewer specialists, who could deal as he dealt with sciolism in the garb of erudition. If any one wishes to understand the true meaning of the Ornaments Rubric, and to answer the question whether Queen Elizabeth 'took further order,' he will find Sir Lewis Dibdin's interrogatories a better guide than all the answers of all the witnesses put together. I should be the last person to underrate the value of historical knowledge. But

Acts of Parliament are written in technical language, and some acquaintance with legal terminology, as with legal principles, is necessary to make them intelligible.

These four volumes, which can be obtained for a few shillings, prove beyond a shadow of doubt that a large number of clergymen, and a small number of laymen, in the Church of England are thoroughly disloyal to the Reformation, to the Protestant principle of private judgment, and to the Crown. At least three thousand incumbents, holding benefices in the endowed and established Church which Henry the Eighth and his Parliament finally severed from Rome, persist in wearing vestments, and in performing gestures, which the King's Courts established by statute have in the King's name pronounced to be illegal. Every one of these reverend gentlemen accepted his living with full knowledge that the Church of England is a Parliamentary Church, and that the ultimate authority in all ecclesiastical disputes is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This is not a matter of opinion. It is a matter of fact. Historically, the Privy Council in 1832, and the Judicial Committee in 1833, were substituted for the Court of Delegates, to which Henry transferred the jurisdiction of the Pope. Legally, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is the only body, except Parliament itself, which can determine in the last resort if a ceremony is unlawful, or a doctrine is heretical. Whether this ought to be the case is a fair question for argument. That it is the case no barrister of six months' standing would venture to deny. Yet many clergymen seem to think that it is rather meritorious than otherwise to retain their offices and emoluments while they refuse compliance with the conditions under which they were presented by their patrons, and instituted by their bishops. No truth is simpler, or more constantly evaded, than the proposition that an Established Church must be Erastian, or, in other words, subordinate to the State. The Bishop of Birmingham, who was a scholar of Balliol, and a Fellow of Trinity, told the Commission that he could not see the difference in point of freedom and independence between the national Church and any other religious body. 'Then why are we here?' asked the chairman. He might also have asked why the Bishop of Birmingham sits in the House of Lords. A Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Church of Rome, or the Church of the Wesleyan Methodists, would be obviously impertinent. A Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in the Church of England was urgently required by flagrant scandals, and the Bishop of Birmingham himself volunteered to give evidence before it.

It is these men, habitual repudiators of Protestantism and violators of the law, who are the life and soul of the resistance to Mr. Birrell's Bill, because they put dogma before virtue, morality, and truth. They are not, I am well aware, the only opponents of the measure. Mr. Balfour is fond of referring in this connection to the Bishop of

Liverpool, and of describing him as the head of the Low Church party. Under pressure in debate he once added, by way of after-thought, the Dean of Canterbury. The Bishop of Liverpool is a scholarly member of the Evangelical school.' But he is no more the leader of the Low Church party than I am, and, as a matter of fact, the Church Association has expressed approval of the Bill. The Dean of Canterbury is also a learned and accomplished Protestant. But he has a fad. He believes in securing ecclesiastical peace by returning to the practices of the sixth century. 'When, however, he was closely questioned by the Commissioners, he admitted that there were practices of the sixth century which he would not revive, and others of more recent origin which he would retain, thereby making his exceptions at least as large as his rule. The fact is, of course, that the Education Bill has long become an affair of party, and that Conservatives oppose it because it is a Liberal measure. The Bishop of Manchester, for instance, who is so little a friend to the Ritualists that he would abolish the Episcopal veto on their prosecution, has denounced the Bill in terms which would be thought excessive if they were applied to the persecution of Christians by the Emperor Nero. But then the Bishop of Manchester is a Tory of the Tories, and considers it the duty of the Speaker to throw all Liberal measures out of the window. It remains true that the vehemence of the agitation against the Bill is supplied by the men who are trying to Romanise the Church of England; and that the same Bill, if passed by the Lords as it stands, would strike their conspiracy a mortal blow by delivering from their clutches the children of the poor.

I propose to deal in this article with the evidence of two typical witnesses, one a clergyman and the other a layman, the Bishop of Southwark and Lord Halifax, both of whom are pretty sure to take part in debate in Committee on the Education Bill. But before I come to them I should like to say a word about the extraordinary titles which the editor of these State papers has taken it upon himself to confer. It is, perhaps, scarcely worth while to remark upon Suffragans, who are not, and can never become, Lords of Parliament, being styled 'Lord Bishops.' A cynical parson once told me that the principal duty of a Suffragan was persuading or inducing people to call him 'my Lord.' But 'the Most Reverend the Lord Bishop of St. Andrews' does astonish me in a formal document presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of his Majesty. How can Dr. Wilkinson, or anybody else, have the right to call himself Bishop of St. Andrews? Parliament has not thought fit to create territorial dioceses in Scotland, and the Protestant Episcopalians of that country are as much Dissenters as the Presbyterians are here. But perhaps the weirdest freak of the editor in the way of titles is 'the Lord Bishop of Albany.' Surely most schoolboys know that there are no lords in the United States. It is a little hard to make an American bishop, a

most respectable man, ridiculous in the eyes of his fellow-countrymen, who happily visit this country in such a vast and constant stream. Now I come to the Bishop of Southwark. That excellent prelate gave his evidence as Bishop of Rochester. But it is the same Edward Talbot, scholarly, devout, accomplished, urbane. The High Church could not have a better spokesman, and the pretensions which he puts forward may be regarded as the most gilded form of the pill that the English people are asked to swallow. The bishop proved a most eager, voluble witness. His courtesy is charming, he has a great belief in words, and every question put to him elicited something like a treatise. The Bishop of Southwark is a man who cares nothing for rank, wealth, or position, and has entirely devoted himself to Christian work of the most practical kind at Keble College, in Leeds, and in the South of London. He is everything that he ought to be, except a Protestant, and it is time for the English people to realise what the exception means. Six or seven years ago Sir William Harcourt, always a stout Erastian, took a prominent part, chiefly by letters to the *Times*, in denouncing Ritualism as defiance of ecclesiastical law. All the practices which Sir William condemned had been pronounced illegal by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, so that there could be no question about their irregularity. This is the language in which the Bishop of Southwark speaks of the episode : 'All that attempt, of course [sic], was in the highest degree indiscriminating. There was nothing in it likely to make any appeal to the persons who needed control,' that is the clergymen who were breaking the law : 'on the contrary, speaking broadly, all the principles which they attached value to were treated with contumely, and the effect likely to be produced upon them by that was all for harm, and all for the weakening and disabling of legitimate authority. It swept across the track at that time, and certainly made our difficulties very much greater.' What does the Bishop of Southwark mean by legitimate authority ? Sir William Harcourt appealed to nothing else. The bishop, who has twice done homage to the Crown for the temporalities of his Sees, who was appointed by the Crown on the advice of a secular statesman, treats the King in Council as having no legitimate authority at all. How can the inferior clergy be expected to obey the law when that is the example set them by the best of their fathers in God ? Upon one point the Bishop of Southwark's amiable volubility came to a sudden stop. At the church of St. Agnes, Kennington, in the diocese of Rochester, there was a service on Palm Sunday, 1904, called 'The Blessing and Procession of Palms,' quite unknown to the Church of England, accompanied, as it would be in the Church of Rome, with lights and incense. The Bishop remonstrated with the incumbent about this service, and he was asked by Lord St. Aldwyn the plain question 'Has he since undertaken to stop it ?' 'I think,' replied his lordship, 'I will not say anything

more about it.' A Royal Commission cannot compel a witness to answer. But the public will draw their own conclusions from the episcopal silence.

The Bishop of Southwark claims a great deal of power, far more than he would concede to Commons, Lords, and King. For instance, he maintains his right to authorise the use in the churches of his diocese of collects outside the Book of Common Prayer, as for St. Agnes, and for the Beheading of St. John the Baptist. 'Supposing,' said Lord St. Aldwyn, 'the collect for St. Agnes Day and the collect for the Beheading of St. John the Baptist were the collects in use in the Roman Church for those days, should you have sanctioned them?' 'I should not care in the least,' replied the Bishop, 'whether they were the collects in the Roman Church or not, if they did not seem to me to be in themselves objectionable.' Now the Bishop knows perfectly well that the fact of these prayers being used by the Church of Rome is not an accident. Nor is it an accident that they have been omitted from our Prayer Book. They were omitted by the Reformers because they were, from a Protestant point of view, superstitious, and they are reintroduced by the Ritualistic clergy with his approval for precisely the same reason. In other words, his lordship desires, in this as in other respects, to undo what the Reformation did. That he has no legal authority to permit the adulteration of the Prayer Book by extraneous matter, which he promised when he became a bishop to banish and drive away, does not concern him at all. He could hardly go further if, instead of being Bishop of Southwark, he were Bishop of Rome. But then he would have no authority within this realm of England. There are some points, I think, on which the High Churchmen have a strong case, and on which they would meet with a good deal of sympathy even from those who do not share their general opinions. There is nothing in the authoritative documents of the English Church which prohibits prayers for the dead, and it is surely presumptuous in any human being to limit the scope of prayer. I have never myself been able to see why a cross, the great symbol of Christianity, or even a crucifix, if it be not itself worshipped, as nowadays it hardly ever would, should not be openly exhibited in a Christian church. The reservation of the Sacrament, on the other hand, is forbidden by the rubric on the express, and expressly Protestant, ground that it implies the adoration of the elements. There are places, such as hospitals, where exception may properly be made, for the comfort and succour of the sick and dying. But no one can read this evidence impartially without perceiving that what the clergy mean by the necessity of reservation for the sick is their own personal prejudice against communicating themselves at what they choose to consider unsuitable times. Of course any layman who prefers to communicate fasting is perfectly free to do so. But fasting communion is not the rule in the Church of England, and all the parsons in England have no right to make it so. Those who think that to communicate

without fasting, or without confession, is wrong, should join the Church of Rome. It is, no doubt, perfectly true that few clergymen of any school observe with punctilious scrupulosity all the directions of the rubric. The celebration of the Communion with the intention that there should be no communicants is a plain defiance of the Prayer Book, like hiding the act of consecration, or saying the words inaudibly. But it would be tyrannical to censure a clergyman for administering the sacrament to two persons when he had expected that there would be more, or for not insisting upon the obsolete direction that communicants must give previous notice. Take, again, the obligation of daily service, both morning and afternoon. The Commissioners find as a fact that this duty is impartially neglected by High, Low, and Broad. No Court would inflict a penalty upon a clergyman who refused to address his wife and his clerk as 'dearly beloved brethren.' The whole service implies the presence of a reasonable congregation, by which I mean a congregation of reasonable size. At the same time it is only fair to say that the restoration of daily services in populous places where they should never have been disused, is mainly the work of High Churchmen, who are so far carrying out their legal as well as their pastoral functions. The ceremonial use of incense and of candles is, on the other hand, as direct and deliberate a violation of the law as the wearing of special vestments for the Holy Communion in parish churches. The ablest representative of the Ritualists who appeared before the Commission, Dr. Cobb, said frankly that, so long as the Church was established, he considered himself and other clergymen to be bound by the decisions of the Judicial Committee. Dr. Cobb, however, professed that he could not understand what these decisions were. As regards vestments, I can scarcely believe that Dr. Cobb is serious. It is open for him, or for anybody else, to say that in his opinion *Clifton v. Ridsdale* was wrongly decided. Anyone might say as much, or as little, of any judgment in any court. But it cannot be doubted that in *Clifton v. Ridsdale* the surplice was pronounced by the final Court of Appeal the only legal vestment for use in parish churches, to the exclusion of albs, copes, chasubles, and all such other things. It is equally indisputable that these Ritualistic vestments are worn for the purpose of showing that the Holy Communion is identical with that mysterious and sacrificial rite which Catholics call the Mass. To substitute Mass for Communion is the simplest and most obvious mode of annulling the Reformation, reintroducing priestcraft, and banishing Protestantism from the Church of England. That these illegal ceremonies are sometimes due to bad taste, love of what is ugly and tawdry, want of reverence for the simple beauty of ancient churches, I should readily admit. But underlying them all is the sentiment which glories in the name of Catholic, and uses Protestant, or 'Prot,' as a term of abuse.

There are at least three thousand clergymen who habitually break

the law by wearing 'vestments.' The evidence given before the Commission has dispelled the idea that the bishops have, by exercising their power of veto, prevented the prosecution of these law-breakers. In one case the Bishop of London did himself threaten prosecution, and the clergyman at once resigned his living to join the Church of Rome. In most cases it seems to have been assumed that prosecution would not be allowed, and the evidence of the bishops justifies the assumption. They think that they can interpret the Ornaments Rubric better than the most eminent judges of the land, and that the clergy cannot be expected to 'recognise,' or in plain English to obey, the King's Courts. I need not waste words in arguing the utter futility of such a position when taken up by the Parliamentary prelates of a Parliamentary Church. No power on earth except Parliament can set aside a statutory order of the King in Council. It seems to be thought that the judgments of the Privy Council are less final than the judgments of the House of Lords, first because they are only binding in England upon ecclesiastical courts, and secondly because they take the form of advice to the Crown. The first point is irrelevant because *Clifton v. Ridsdale* was an ecclesiastical case. The second appears to be founded upon *Read v. the Bishop of Lincoln*. The Bishop of Lincoln, I may observe, was not charged with wearing vestments, and therefore that part of the judgment in *Clifton v. Ridsdale* was not even reviewed. Their Lordships did no doubt suggest that the legality of altar lights might at some future time be reconsidered, though all they actually held was that the Bishop could not be made responsible for their use in any church when he happened to officiate. But if anyone will read carefully the judgment delivered by Lord Halsbury, who was then Lord Chancellor, he will see that no distinction whatever is made between the Judicial Committee and any other court. Lord Halsbury drew an entirely different line. The judgment of a final tribunal, he said, was absolutely binding and irreversible where it affected the devolution of property or personal rights. Where it dealt with historical and constitutional questions, it might be reconsidered with the help of fresh knowledge, such as Archbishop Benson had discovered by his researches into the origin of ecclesiastical candles. As a lawyer's tribute to history this doctrine is valuable and important. But nothing is known about vestments now which was not known in 1877, and there is not the smallest chance of *Clifton v. Ridsdale* being reversed. If it were there would be a schism in the Church compared with which the Oxford movement was a very little thing. This I say as a matter of fact, knowing very well, and with private reasons for knowing, that the judgment in *Clifton v. Ridsdale* did not command the universal approval of lawyers. *Interest reipublicæ ut sit finis litium*. But while of this particular litigation there is happily an end, the situation remains without parallel in the history of the Church. Three thousand

clergymen refuse either to surrender their benefices or to obey the law. Some at least of the bishops support them in their attitude, and the result is anarchy. If it be asked why these gentlemen do not become real Catholics, one answer is suggested in the able memorandum laid before the Commissioners by the Bishop of Bristol. A Catholic prelate in the West of England issued a circular the other day to announce that any priest within his episcopal jurisdiction who presumed to criticise his conduct would be '*ipso facto* suspended' from any ecclesiastical office he held. That is how they enforce discipline in the Catholic Church. In the Church of England every beneficed clergyman is a freeholder and can snap his fingers at his bishop. If the Bishop of Bristol, who is a law-abiding man, were to remind a Gloucestershire ritualist that he had twice taken an oath of canonical obedience to his father in God, the ritualist would probably reply that his Lordship's directions were uncanonical, and that therefore it was canonical to disobey them. The question is how long the people of England will tolerate these endowed but contumacious priests.

The evidence is not favourable to any solution short of disestablishment. The Bishop of Southwark, among many voluntary statements, delivered himself of these truly remarkable sentences :

I wanted to say a few words, if I might, upon the evidence which has been submitted to the Commissioners. First with regard to the method of that evidence from persons who have made it their business to attend services with a view of noting every movement, action, or word which was used by those who were conducting those services. I quite recognise that the Commissioners appointed as they have been must naturally accept evidence of that kind ; but, without desiring to dwell upon it, I must express my own instinctive feeling, because I am quite sure it is a feeling which is very widely shared, that the collecting and presenting of evidence of this kind in this way by persons paid or unpaid for the purpose is *mali exempli* : that it is a kind of method which is not very English and not very creditable——

Sir Edward Clarke : Creditable to whom ?

To the persons who do it.

Few more astounding declarations have ever been made by a bishop, or indeed by any responsible person. This Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline was appointed by a Conservative Government in the name of the King to obtain authentic information upon the manner in which public worship is celebrated in the Established Church. Several witnesses of good character and reputation—one of them, Mr. Bowen, himself a clergyman—took the trouble to collect facts for the use of the Commissioners in the first place, and of the public in the second. Whereupon the Bishop of Southwark denounces them as if they were spies and informers, hired to procure by surreptitious means some scandalous gossip affecting private character. He cannot be surprised if mere laymen remember a text about those who refuse to come to the light because their deeds are evil. What has an honest clergyman to fear from a description of

his behaviour in church? The witnesses who appeared for the Protestants of England gave their evidence with perfect propriety in the gravest and most reverent manner. It was indispensable, for without it the Commissioners could not have carried out the terms of their reference by drawing up a report. Lady Wimborne in particular merits the gratitude of all Protestants for her patient industry and minute accuracy. When the most has been made of the errors into which other witnesses fell, these do not affect the main issue of obedience to authority or defiance of the law. The letters sent to the Secretary of the Commission by mutinous clerks are very different in tone. Most of them end with a calm assertion, couched in identical phraseology, that they do not interpret the *Omnements Rubric* as it was interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and therefore cannot obey the law. A few are written with a flippancy and irreverence which make it painful to reflect that men capable of writing them are allowed to profane by administering God's Word and sacraments. The Bishop of Southwark has nothing to say against the idea that the clergy are *mystagogues*, performing private rites upon which the profane vulgar must not intrude. On the contrary, he rather encourages it, as also the comfortable doctrine that if a man does not like the services in his own church, he can go to another. This of course is pure Congregationalism and quite irreconcilable with any form of national establishment. The Bishop comments in language which he himself calls 'severe,' and others might call impertinent, upon 'aggressive movements of a Protestant kind.' In short he uses just the same language in speaking of Protestants as a Catholic Bishop would consistently employ. Was not the Reformation an aggressive movement of a Protestant kind? The Bishop of Southwark should remember what the late Cardinal Vaughan said of Lord Halifax: 'This nobleman is not, and has never been, a Catholic.' The Bishop of Southwark talks much of 'faithful and loyal men.' By faithful men he means men unfaithful to the Reformation, and by loyal men he means those who reject the authority of the King's Courts. One of the incriminated clergy had the assurance to complain of a witness because the witness was a passive resister. If the passive resisters were in receipt of tithes, glebes, rent charges, or other public endowments, there would be some ground of comparison between them and the Ritualists.

The Bishop of Southwark is a public officer responsible to the country for his administration of a high trust. Lord Halifax as a layman and a private individual, even as a Peer of Parliament, is free to take his own course, nor perhaps would it very much matter what course he took. But Lord Halifax is also, and has been for many years, President of the English Church Union, to which the Bishop of Lincoln belongs. It is therefore interesting, if not surprising, to read his statement, made 'quite distinctly,' that 'we do repudiate the

authority of the existing courts to determine the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England.' In reply to the Lord Chief Justice Lord Halifax explained that he repudiated the Court of Arches as well as the Judicial Committee. The theory of Lord Halifax, and of the English Church Union, as representative a body of High Churchmen as could well be found, is that the Church of England is not a national Church at all, but part of a much larger body, to which the Roman and Greek Churches also belong. Rather than submit to the Privy Council Lord Halifax and his clients would submit to the Pope. The Church of England, they tell us, is a 'local Church,' and cannot forbid the Romish reservation of the sacrament. But it is needless to pursue this question further. Here is the definite answer given by the President of the English Church Union to Lord Northampton's question what living authority he and those he represented would accept:

We are absolutely ready to submit ourselves to the judgments, and to obey the commands, of the archbishops and bishops of England sitting in their respective synods, if they will consider themselves bound by the common law and general custom of the Holy Catholic Church to which they profess to belong.

Lord Halifax will obey the Bishops if the Bishops will do as he tells them. Is this the sort of Church which the people of England desire to see established and endowed? Are the numerous clergymen for whom Lord Halifax speaks the sort of instructors that Englishmen desire for their children in national schools?

We have denied, and we deny again, that a new religious establishment was set up in England in the sixteenth century. We have denied, and we deny again, the right of the Crown or Parliament to determine the doctrine, the discipline, and the ceremonial of the Church of England.

These words are taken from a manifesto issued by the English Church Union on the 28th of February, 1899. What do they mean? They mean denial of the Reformation as a fact and of Protestantism as a creed. They mean priestcraft and the closed Bible. The Bible is described in the sermon of a Ritualist, quoted before the Commission, as a most dangerous book, only to be interpreted by priests. The Bishop of Birmingham in his evidence complains of hymns, such as Charles Wesley's, some of the most beautiful in the English language, as inconsistent with the Prayer Book. It does not seem to have struck his Lordship that they may be consistent with the Bible. That is not an episcopal manual. It is of course perfectly true that the evidence taken before this Commission does not affect or concern the majority of English clergymen. But the large and growing minority who repudiate Parliament and the law, with the connivance and approval of some at least among the Bishops, are forcing upon the public the questions, Is the Church of England Protestant? and Shall a Church which is not Protestant be allowed to call itself national? If no, then Disestablishment is the only remedy. The

failure of the Public Worship Act is a beacon and a warning against mere enforcement of discipline by the secular arm. Meanwhile the Education Bill, if it becomes law before Christmas, will do much to diminish the evil. It will substitute the simple teaching of the Christian religion for the dogmas of men who make the Word of God of none effect by their traditions. There is a stronger power in this country than the House of Lords, and the will of the people will decide, as the House of Commons has already decided, for the Bible against the Bishops.

HERBERT PAUL.

*MR. HALDANE BETWEEN THE DEVIL
AND THE DEEP SEA.*

It is curious how history repeats itself. It shows us that every war in which this country has been engaged has been followed by a cry for retrenchment and the cutting down of military expenditure. The greater the enthusiasm, the greater has been the reaction. The cold fit succeeds the hot, and the nation begins pulling down all that with infinite trouble and expense it has built up. In times of crisis money is spent like water as the natural result of want of preparation when things are quiet. This unreasoning reaction, fanned by the exigencies of party warfare and the necessity of living up to pre-election promises, made itself felt after the Napoleonic wars and after the Crimea, and we now once more find ourselves placing our Army in the melting-pot and reducing its numbers with a light-hearted disregard of our increased responsibilities, and the ominous warnings in Egypt, Natal, and other parts of the world. Those who wish to understand what want of preparation means have only to turn to the recently published volume of the official account of the South African War. Lord Wolseley in a memorandum to the Secretary of State says, 'We have committed one of the greatest blunders in war; we have given the enemy the initiative: he is in the position to take the offensive and, by striking the first blow, to ensure the great advantage of winning the first round.' All Englishmen can remember the paralysing effect which this had in the early days of the war, and it is no exaggeration to say that much of what we are at this moment paying in consequence might have been saved by a little forethought and a little preparation.

Now politicians, not soldiers, were responsible for this state of affairs. The late Government refrained from making preparations for fear of offending the Boers, and the present Prime Minister, then in Opposition, said he saw no reason for military preparation, and condemned the sending of batteries to the Cape. All this time it was well known that President Kruger had been spending over a million a year for several years in arming, and that his preparations could have no other object than an attempt to oust the British and form an independent South Africa under the flag of the Republic. The fact

remains that we went to war absolutely unprepared for the task we were undertaking, and Lord Roberts has over and over again within the last few months told the country that it is no more fit to undertake a big war now than it was in 1899. It seems that the lesson we got then has been entirely forgotten, and that the ordinary citizen is content to allow the politicians to go on tinkering at the army, and quite fails to recognise his own responsibility in the matter.

While in no way underestimating the difficulties with which Mr. Haldane has to contend, it seems to me that, judged by his own standard of efficiency, his scheme falls short of what the country had been led to expect. I do not think he is to blame for this. He is between the devil and the deep sea. On the one side stands the extreme section of the Radical party pledged to reduction, no matter what the consequences, and on the other those more moderate men who wish for economy, but only if it can be attained without loss of efficiency. One cannot help feeling that his Imperial instincts drag him one way while the exigencies of Party loyalty drag him another. To steer between Scylla and Charybdis, or to serve God and Mammon, are child's play compared to the difficulty of reconciling these conflicting claims, and when the feat has been accomplished the state of national defence remains very much where it was before. The scheme is essentially a compromise, and it has all the defects inherent to compromises in that it pleases neither one party nor the other, and quite fails to solve the problem to the satisfaction of either school of thought. Of course, if economies could be effected without loss of efficiency all men would rejoice, but if efficiency suffers I maintain that any reduction is the falsest of false economies and inconsistent with a sound national policy.

It was pointed out recently in an admirable letter of the military correspondent of *The Times* that in addition to the 20,000 men the Government proposes to reduce, another 23,000 men must be taken off from the military strength of the country. These are made up as follows: 16,000 of the D Reserve, whose transfer to the Reserve is to be stopped this year. These men engage for a further period of four years after their twelve years' engagement has terminated, so that in four years, at the rate of 4,000 men a year, the whole 16,000 will be blotted out. Then there is the loss of the Reserve of the ten battalions and the Artillery, which he computed at 7,000, these units having all been Reserve-producing bodies. The reduction will therefore in reality be 43,000, and not 20,000 as announced by the Government. We have, it is true, vague and indefinite suggestions as to an improved and efficient Militia, but how the men are to be got or what their training is to be are all matters on which we get no light whatever. What the country wants is clearer and more definite information as to the intentions of the Government with regard to the steps they intend to take as compensations for these reductions

from, our already diminutive Army. The scheme is admittedly incomplete, and its discussion in the House of Commons was too restricted to elucidate the many points which want clearing up before a definite judgment can be pronounced on it as a whole. The destructive portion is clear enough, but its constructive side is vague and indefinite in the extreme. We know what is to be abolished, but we have to content ourselves with vague generalities in our attempt to find out what is to replace those units which have to be sacrificed in order to appease the more extreme supporters of the Government.

I cannot but think that it would have been wiser and more statesman-like first to have created a substitute, and then to have got rid of what was found to be superfluous from the point of view of efficiency. It is regrettable that any reduction of battalions should be determined on without first ensuring that the resuscitated Militia has been rendered capable—as it is not at the present time—of rendering efficient service in the field. We have not yet been told how we are to get the Militiamen who are to undertake the duties now performed by the Regulars, and what arrangements are to be made for their training, nor yet how we are to get men of nineteen instead of boys of seventeen. If the Militia are to get more training, increased expenditure must be incurred, and if they remain as they are, we have the authority of the Norfolk Commission for the statement: ‘We are forced to the conclusion that the Militia in its existing condition is unfit to take the field for the defence of this country.’ That the Militia are to undertake service abroad in case of national emergency is, I think, all to the good, but it would be interesting to know what inducements are to be held out to them before they accept these increased responsibilities. Now we are told that an expeditionary force of 150,000 men is at all times to be ready to take the field. It is to be composed of 50,000 Regulars, 70,000 Reservists, and 30,000 men on a Militia basis. The question arises, are these men to be drafted into the Line or are they to be mobilised as units? If the latter, we should know what steps are to be taken to make them efficient, and if the former, in what way they differ from the 30,000 Militia Reserve which existed at the time of the South African War, and which has since been abolished? Then, are Militiamen still to be permitted to enlist in the Line? Are these men to be provided by bleeding the Militia regiments of their best men? That is an important point on which information is required, as it has always been a cause of serious complaint among the Militia regiments that they have been used merely as feeders to the Line. Then there is the question of how the shortage of officers is to be made up, and how they are to be made efficient? Lord Roberts has told us that some regiments of Militia came out to South Africa ten officers short, and that in consequence he could not have used them at the front. The Norfolk Commission tells us: ‘The less the training of the rank and

file, the higher is the training and knowledge required of the officer. The training of the Militia officer is inadequate to enable him properly to lead troops, and especially incompletely trained troops.' The present shortage in the Auxiliary forces approaches 4,000, and it cannot be too often repeated that this dearth of officers is the most serious problem our military advisers have to face. Now the formation of a General Staff is a step in the right direction, and is the natural result of the recommendations of the Esher Committee. It is a matter of congratulation that we are at last to be provided with a thinking body whose province it will be to act as the Brain of the Army, and to take precautions so that we may be prepared for any eventuality. The advantages to be derived from the working out by experts of the various problems which affect the safety and well-being of the Empire are so obvious, that it is difficult to understand how we have done without this thinking department so long. Its appearance at the present moment has no doubt been accelerated by the recent visit of the Secretary of State to Germany, though its advantages have been recognised at the War Office since its inception by the Hartington Commission some years ago. Still the Government are entitled to credit for having put these principles in practice. While, however, welcoming this addition to the efficiency of the Army, we must not forget that the best laid schemes are useless without men and still more so without officers. No general, however brilliant, can put his plans in practice without a sufficiency of regimental officers to carry them through. It is the generals who give the orders, but it is the battalion and company leaders on whom the final success or failure depends. I think this fact is often lost sight of. So far we have no information as to how these officers are to be got, especially with regard to the Auxiliary forces. On the contrary, the reduction of ten battalions will eventually reduce the number of officers in the Army by over 300, as they gradually become absorbed, and these continual changes are not likely to inspire officers with confidence, or to induce suitable young men who have their way to make in the world to take up soldiering as a profession. Mr. Haldane puts this question as a test of efficiency, 'Are you worth the money spent on you?' Might not the officers reply with some justice, 'Are the terms you offer us worth our while to accept? Is the treatment you mete out to us likely to inspire us with confidence in our future? Is the reduction of ten battalions, and the consequent unemployment and stoppage of promotion, likely to draw more men to a profession in which they are liable to be deprived of their chances of advancement at a moment's notice?' I quite admit that in all changes individuals have to suffer, but I would point out that there is at present very great difficulty in getting officers at all, and that your present policy will not make the task easier.

Now one cannot but regret the abolition of units, not from senti-

mental reasons, but because of their power of expansion. It certainly seems incongruous to keep on repeating that expansion is what is wanted, and at the same time to do away with the very machinery which renders expansion easy. Surely it would have been possible to retain this power while at the same time reducing the numbers of men with the Colours. The system which obtains in the Navy of having reserve ships with nucleus crews, to which Mr. Haldane refers with reference to the Artillery, should apply with equal force to the Army, and it does seem a pity to do away with the framework, which can be so easily expanded in times of crisis, and to destroy an organisation which it is difficult to replace in a hurry. The use to which the organisation of the Yeomanry was put during the late war is an example of the advantage to be gained from existing machinery. When new units have to be raised the difficulties are increased tenfold by the hurried creation of a new Staff and new officers who are unknown to each other, and who have been unaccustomed to work together. The disbanding of two battalions of Guards is, I venture to think, a mistake; and here again I put on one side the question of sentiment, though no one appreciates more highly than I do the value of sentiment in soldiering, together with the spirit of *esprit de corps* which it engenders.

I base my objections purely on practical grounds, and on the grounds of the efficiency of the Army as a whole, and I maintain that, judged by their own standard, the Government has shown no valid reason for the disbandment of these two splendid battalions.

In deciding whether a unit was to remain or not, Mr. Haldane made use of the words: 'The purpose of the Government has been to go through every department of the Army and ask each man, "What are you here for? Do you justify the money that is spent on you?" If he cannot answer he goes off. If he can make out a case of efficiency for war he remains.' Now the answer to these questions in the case as to whether these battalions are efficient for war is emphatically 'Yes.' It is not even suggested that they are not in an efficient state. On the contrary, they are known to be in a very high state of efficiency. The excuse given seems to be that if the Line were reduced and not the Guards, it would give rise to jealousy. Jealousy, therefore, and not efficiency is to be the standard. It is well to know where we are. Lord Wolseley always said that a strong Guards Brigade was the corollary of short service as exemplified in the Cardwell system, and that a strong body of troops at headquarters, who could be quickly mobilised and sent anywhere at a moment's notice, was a very valuable asset to the military strength of the Empire. The Guards exactly fulfil these conditions. Their three years' service gives them a much larger reserve than the Line, and, having no drafts to find, they are not in the condition of 'Squeezed Lemons,' and can be brought up to war strength in a very much shorter time

than any other units. Now it does seem the height of midsummer madness to destroy units of this stamp in order to replace them with 'something on a Militia basis'; to abolish these battalions, which we know can be relied upon, and which have proved their value over and over again, both at home and in the field, and to replace them with troops which may or may not turn out efficient, and which in any case must be inferior to the cadres which they are replacing.

Again, if some reduction must be made as a sop to the extreme supporters of the Government, and as a justification to their somewhat extravagant election speeches, why not reduce numbers instead of units? The objection which may be raised in the case of the Line, that it would interfere with the supply of drafts, does not apply to the Guards, as they have no drafts to find. Then there is the hardship inflicted upon officers and non-commissioned officers of the units disbanded. One of the subalterns told me he would have got his promotion in two years, but that now it would probably be four or five years before he became a captain. Can anything be more disheartening to a keen young officer? The absorption of all the captains in the other two battalions will of course stop all promotion among the subalterns for a very long time.

Then these changes will also involve great hardship on a most deserving and efficient class of men, I mean the N.C.O.s of the battalion. Men such as quarter-master sergeants, pay sergeants and drill sergeants, &c., who have worked their way up to their present position, will find their chances of further promotion sadly curtailed, and of course the sergeants and other N.C.O.s coming on behind them will in a similar manner be deprived of their chances of advancement, no matter how gradually the changes are brought about. In the Report of the Royal Commission on the War in South Africa we find the following instructive paragraph: 'At the outbreak of the war there was in the Regular Army and Reserve insufficient trained men of an age fit for foreign service to meet the emergency which arose, even when practically the whole Reserve had been used.'

Now the chief lesson to be derived from the late Russo-Japanese War was that the country which can bring the greatest number of trained Reserves into the field will in the end prove victorious, and I venture to think that any system which does not give us trained Reserves in place of men with muskets must be unsound and a danger to the Empire. Till, however, the country awakes to its responsibilities in the matter, and insists on the training of its whole manhood for home defence, I confess I despair of ever seeing our Army capable of the expansion necessary to meet a grave national crisis. Everything depends on the question of training. Untrained men are practically valueless in modern warfare. 'A nation in arms,' if it means a nation of trained soldiers ready to take their places in the ranks at a

moment's notice, is the ideal at which all Army reformers should aim, but the value of the men is dependent on the quality and extent of their training. To my mind the question of our military efficiency resolves itself to a great extent into one of the state of training of our Reserve forces, among whom I include Militia, Volunteers and Yeomanry. If these troops can, under a voluntary system, be trained and disciplined (for no amount of drill will make up for the want of discipline) to meet the highly organised troops of foreign countries, all will be well. But is this so? So far we have no indication how this end is to be achieved; we have merely a suggestion by the Secretary of State in a speech delivered recently at Newcastle, that the Volunteer force should be expanded, and that if (and I venture to think this is a very big If) we have sufficient national enthusiasm, we may manage to get into the field and maintain an Army of seven, or eight, or nine hundred thousand men. If, however, these are to be merely an unorganised mass, with nothing but the most elementary training, the expression 'A Nation in Arms' is a misleading one, and becomes a positive danger by lulling the country into a sense of false security quite unjustified by the circumstances. The late Government failed to send out trained Reserves to South Africa because it gambled on the war being over eighteen months before it really came to an end. The second lot of Yeomanry arrived at the seat of war absolutely untrained. They could neither ride nor shoot, and would have been useless against highly organised troops. No doubt in times of emergency plenty of men will come forward for the defence of the country, but they will be untrained, and the contention that we shall always have time to train them is based on no solid foundation whatever. As an example of the necessity of being prepared, take our guarantee of the neutrality of Belgium, which might land us in hostilities with a continental Power at very short notice. The recent disappointment of the hopes of an heir to the throne of Holland has made the possibility of future complications on the Continent distinctly less unlikely. Is it probable that in certain eventualities our potential enemies will sit still while we train our men? I think not. And yet the country is content to muddle along with an Army incapable of rapid expansion, and with auxiliary forces admittedly incapable in their present state of meeting the trained forces of other nations.

When we approach the question of how the Volunteers are to be made efficient, we have little or no information except that no further money is to be spent on them. The extent of sympathetic treatment which they may expect was shown not long ago when they were denied any assistance from the Government in the hiring of ranges. At a time when it is recognised on all sides that accurate shooting is of the first importance, I do not think this decision is likely to encourage the Volunteer movement. Then there seem only to be

duties for 170,000 Volunteers out of 250,000. It would be interesting to know what is to become of the balance.

Then comes the reduction of 3,850 men in the Artillery, and the manning of the reduced batteries by Militiamen. Taking into consideration the difficulty of improvising gunners in a hurry, it does not seem wise to hand over a large proportion of the Artillery to partially trained troops at a time when the importance of accurate shooting is recognised on all sides. In the Navy no pains are spared to make our seamen efficient artillerists. Again, it is acknowledged that our Artillery is too weak already. It will all be used up with the Regular troops, and there will be none left for the mobilisation of the Volunteers or for the native Army in India. It is misleading to say that in India there are five guns to 1,000 bayonets, because the native Army is not taken into consideration in this calculation.

Now we come to the alteration in the terms of service. The Line are to go back to seven years with the Colours and five in the Reserve, and I cannot but think that this is the best time and the best form of service. A man gets thoroughly trained and disciplined in seven years, and the quality, if not the quantity, of the Reserve is improved. I know that it is said soldiers can be made abroad in two years, and why cannot they be made here in the same time. Well, if we had a system of compulsion this would be perfectly feasible, but in the meantime we dare not work our soldiers as they do abroad. If we did, under a voluntary system we could not get the recruits, and many of those who did enlist would desert at the first opportunity. No doubt the enlistment for three years with the Colours and nine in the Reserve tends to increase the latter enormously, but then we cannot for obvious reasons send three-year men to India. The late War Minister attempted to bribe these men by an extra sixpence to engage on to seven years, but it always partook of the nature of a gamble, and the gamble, as is sometimes the case, did not come off. The Cardwell system gives on the whole the best results. It trains two men for one, and it was this system that gave us 80,000 splendid Reserve men at the beginning of the late war. Lord Wolseley was always in favour of this system, and held that men trained in battalions were infinitely superior to those trained in depots.

Then there is the scheme for bringing local influence to bear on recruiting and shuffling on to the shoulders of the County Council the responsibility for providing recruits. A foreign correspondent in *The Times* the other day said 'he was unable to grasp the idea of an Army raised in detachments like fire brigades, and managed in the same way.' The object is of course to get as large Reserves as possible with small peace establishment. Without compulsion this is impossible, and all other schemes must be compromises and foredoomed to failure. This attempt to shuffle the responsibility of organising the auxiliary forces on to the shoulders of the local bodies is obviously

a confession of weakness on the part of the War Office, and I cannot think that this dual control can make for efficiency, and from what we know of County Councils I do not think it will make for economy. To hand over responsibilities which are essentially the business of the State to local bodies elected for political reasons, must be not only a retrograde step, but an experiment of a very risky and hazardous nature.

Now the attitude of the military advisers of the Secretary of State is somewhat of a puzzle to the student of military history. It is almost inconceivable that they can have agreed without a struggle to so large a diminution of the fighting strength of the country, especially as it is difficult (outside the magic circle of the War Office) to find any soldier of standing who does not view the situation created by these reductions with alarm, if not with dismay. Stripped of verbiage, these changes resolve themselves into the reduction of 43,000 trained and efficient men, without any clear indication of how this diminution of the effective fighting power of the country is to be counteracted. The men they abolish are professionals; those with whom they propose to replace them will be amateurs. The Secretary of State tells us that all he proposes is with the sanction and approval of his military advisers, and in the absence of any indications on their part of resigning he is, of course, justified in this contention. Yet it is difficult to understand their attitude. It must be either due to weakness or to an altogether wrong appreciation of the situation as viewed by men who have made these questions their study. That they have allowed themselves to be talked over by the persuasive eloquence of the Secretary of State is probably the solution of the problem, but I do not think it is putting it too strongly when I say their attitude has been a disappointment to all who are interested in the welfare of the Army, and I am convinced that with the exhibition of a little more backbone they would have occupied a more dignified position in the eyes of their fellow soldiers. Now I believe it is claimed by the Government that their action is the result of a mandate which they profess to believe was given them at the election. Now this question of mandates admits of many interpretations according to the exigencies of the hour. The Government certainly had a mandate with regard to Chinese slavery, which they failed to carry out. They engaged to send the Chinese off bag and baggage to their own country if they were given a majority, and *they did not do it*. They posed as budding Wilberforces, but the Chinamen remain, and nothing but force will induce them to renounce their slavery. The fact is, the whole thing is a pose. That the country ever gave them a mandate to destroy professional troops of proved value in the field and replace them by third-rate levies is positively grotesque in its absurdity. I wonder how any business firm would like its expert mechanics replaced by prentice hands managed by the County Council. Why,

the policy of the village pump can hardly go further. There unfortunately is in these days a tendency abroad to shirk responsibility; the citizen turns to the mercenary to carry out duties he should be proud to perform himself, and the War Office shuffles off its responsibilities on to the shoulders of the County Council.

Now the scheme of the Government is so misty and nebulous, and has been presented amid such a deluge of words, that the country is puzzled as to what the meaning of it all is. The public indeed fails to recognise that this dimness is due to its shutting its eyes to the fact that after all War Ministers are only human, and that the conditions under which they struggle to give us an Army suitable to the needs of our ever-growing responsibilities are impossible of attainment. I believe our present War Minister is the best we have had for some time, but his schemes are foredoomed to failure just as were those of his predecessors. His ability is unquestioned, his persuasive eloquence is unrivalled, and his dominant personality has the gift of infusing an energy among his subordinates to a degree unknown for many a day in the War Office. Unlike his chief, he has no illusions as to Disarmament. He differentiates wisely between Militarism and ~~an~~ obligation to defend the interests of the Empire. Yet he has to cut his coat according to his cloth. He is handicapped by extremists on one side, whose only idea of statesmanship is the cutting down of expenses, and by idealists on the other, whose devotion to peace would prevent his using the only methods of securing it. The fact is, no scheme can really give the expansion needed which does not include some form of universal service for home defence. This, with a small but very perfect professional Army for service abroad and small wars, is the only sound or possible solution of the problem, and until this is recognised by the people of the country, Secretaries of State will continue to waste their time in hopeless attempts to make bricks without straw.

ERROLL.

*The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY cannot undertake
to return unaccepted MSS.*

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
· AND AFTER ·



No. CCCLVII—NOVEMBER 1906

THE FUTURE OF GREAT BRITAIN

All States are in perpetual war with all. For that which we call peace is no more than merely a name, whilst in reality Nature has set all communities in an unproclaimed but everlasting war against each other.—PLATO, *De Legibus*, Book I.

It is a law of Nature common to all mankind, which no time shall annul or destroy, that those who have more strength and excellence shall bear rule over those who have less.—DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS, i. 5.

Many desire one and the same thing at once, which frequently they neither will nor can enjoy in common nor yet divide. Hence it follows that the desired objects must be given to the stronger, and who is the stronger can be known only by fighting.—THOMAS HOBBES, *De Corpore Politico*, i. 5.

EXPERIENCE is the mother of wisdom. History is philosophy teaching by example. The laws of history are as immutable as are the laws of nature. If we wish to gauge the future of Great Britain we cannot rely on the theories and views of abstract thinkers, whatever may be their standing, but we must refer to the past for information, and, guided by historical fact and analogy, we may venture upon a forecast based upon knowledge and experience.

Great Britain, with her colonies, is the greatest commercial and maritime State existing. Her greatness is bound up with her commercial and maritime pre-eminence, and dependent upon it. Great Britain, with her colonies, possesses at present commercial and maritime supremacy, but she has not always possessed that supremacy. Nothing is permanent in this world excepting change. Great Britain may lose her power and her wealth. If we wish to understand the problems of Great Britain, and to be able to foresee the difficulties and dangers of the future, and perhaps of the immediate future, we must inquire into the history of those States which at one time possessed commercial and maritime supremacy, and study the causes which led to their political and economic decline.

Phœnicia is the oldest commercial and maritime State of which we have some knowledge. The Phœnicians were merchants and seafarers of the greatest ability, but they owed their commercial and maritime pre-eminence firstly and principally to the nature and geographical position of their country. Their territory was mountainous and poor, but it abounded in excellent ship timber. Nature had compelled the Phœnicians to seek their sustenance on the sea. It is noteworthy that Sidon signifies 'fishery.' The implements used in fishing are said to have been invented in ancient Tyre. The maritime greatness of Phœnicia, as that of Athens, Venice, Genoa, Marseilles, Holland, England, was founded upon the fishing industry. The geographical position of Phœnicia was most favourable. Between the years 1000 and 500 B.C. the greatest civilised States were Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, and Egypt. Phœnicia lay in the very centre of the then civilised world. Owing to their favourable geographical position it was natural that the Phœnicians embarked upon international trade, that they exchanged the productions of the countries surrounding them, that they founded trading establishments in all the neighbouring States—in Nineveh and Memphis vast Phœnician settlements have been unearthed—and that they became exceedingly rich. The demand for men regulates the supply of men. The prosperity of Phœnicia caused a rapid increase of the population, an outlet for the surplus population had to be found, and, whilst extending their trade, the Phœnicians began to establish colonies everywhere on the Mediterranean, and on the coasts of Africa and Asia. According to Strabo, they founded three hundred towns on the West African coast alone. Their trade embraced the civilised and the uncivilised world. They worked silver, gold, and copper mines in Spain, and exploited the tin mines of Cornwall and the Scilly Islands. According to Herodotus, they doubled the Cape of Good Hope two thousand years before Vasco da Gama. Thus the Phœnicians became the pioneers of civilisation. Phœnician culture opened, civilised, and reformed the world.

The Phœnicians brought from foreign countries not only their

wares but also their arts and handicrafts, and perfected them greatly, so that they became the greatest manufacturers in the world. Homer shows in his *Iliad* and *Odyssey* that in his time Phœnicia was the workshop of the world. She was celebrated throughout the universe for her beautiful textiles dyed in marvellous colours, for her wonderful metal and glass ware. Phœnician engineers and workmen built the Temple of Solomon and the Bridge of Xerxes. Phœnician shipping carried on the trade of the world, and the Phœnician navy ruled the sea. The Phœnicians were believed by the ancients to have invented alphabetical writing and numerals, the arts of shipbuilding and navigation, the use of weights and measures and of money, and to have invented countless industrial arts. The Phœnicians were no doubt the Englishmen of antiquity.

In course of time the Phœnician colonies grew up and embarked upon commerce and industry, competing with the mother country. The culture which the Phœnicians had spread led to the rise of new centres of civilisation on the coasts of Greece and of Italy, on the southern coast of France and Spain, and on the northern coast of Africa. New commercial and industrial communities arose and opened up the savage hinterland. Carthage, a colony of the Phœnicians, peopled, like the United States, by political refugees, and situated in the centre of the Mediterranean, had a more favourable geographical situation for the general Mediterranean trade than had Phœnicia herself, and much Phœnician trade fell to Carthage. In the eastern part of the Mediterranean the towns of Greece, which had founded numerous colonies in Asia Minor, began to oust the Phœnicians from those markets which lay nearest to their own ports, and to monopolise the trade of Persia.

According to the text-books of political economy, competition is the soul of business. Competition may be very desirable for the idle consumer whose only interest it is to buy cheaply, but the producer and the merchant wish to obtain a substantial profit on their wares. A nation can derive vast prosperity from its international commerce and from its export industries only if it has, through Nature's bounty or some other cause, practically a monopoly of trade. Free national competition leads, as a rule, to some arrangement among the competing interests, but free international competition brings profits down to the vanishing point. Therefore all the great commercial and industrial nations of the world could arrive at prosperity resulting from its export industries and international trade only by possessing virtually a monopoly, and the destruction of their trading monopoly meant to them the destruction of their greatness and power. Therefore those nations which depend for their existence on their foreign trade must be able to defend their commercial pre-eminence against all attacks, or they will perish.

Carthage being peopled by men of Phœnician blood, Phœnicia

could bear her competition with equanimity, but the competition of the Greeks, aliens to them in race and in civilisation, was unbearable. Apparently through the aggressiveness of the Greeks—the Greeks were professional pirates in the time of Homer—Phœnicia came into collision with her great rivals. It became a question whether Greeks or Phœnicians should possess supremacy on the sea and the trade and the wealth of the world, and arms only could decide that question. According to Herodotus, the celebrated attack of the Persians upon the Greeks was brought about by the Phœnicians. Phœnicia and Carthage attacked Greece and her colonies simultaneously in the east and in the centre of the Mediterranean. Whilst Greece was being attacked by land and sea by an enormous Perso-Phœnician force, the great Greek colonies in Sicily were attacked by a Phœnico-Carthaginian force commanded by Hamilcar, in which, according to Herodotus, 3,000 ships and 300,000 men were engaged. By a curious coincidence, this enormous force was defeated by Gelon at Himera on the very same day on which the Greeks, under Themistocles, totally defeated the Perso-Phœnician navy at Salamis. It is worth noting that the Phœnicians furnished the principal naval contingent at that great sea-battle. The Greek ships were but few if compared with those of their enemy, but the Greeks had not yet become effeminate by luxury, self-indulgence, and vice, and superior bravery and seamanship gave them the victory. By war the Greeks acquired commercial and maritime supremacy in the eastern half of the Mediterranean, and by war they were to lose it.

Through the spreading of civilisation the world had become so much enlarged, and the imperfect construction of ships made the progress of merchantmen so slow, that, after the decline of Phœnicia, the world had room for two great commercial and maritime nations. Carthage, situated in the very centre, between Greece and Spain, between Morocco and Asia Minor, became supreme in the trade of the western Mediterranean and of the seas beyond; whilst the Greeks, situated in the middle between the Greek colonies in Asia Minor and the Greek colonies in Italy, became supreme in the eastern half of that sea. The stony soil of Attica could not nourish the Athenians. Necessity made them fishers, seamen, and traders. The victory of Salamis gave them naval supremacy among the Greeks and barbarians, and practically the monopoly of trade in the eastern half of the Mediterranean. They became immensely wealthy, and Athens became the centre of a large colonial empire. The Greek islands and colonies became tributary to Athens. Athenian fleets and Athenian garrisons protected the Greek islands and colonies against their enemies, and these enriched with their contributions their mighty protectress. The Greeks considered Athens as the centre of the world's trade. Isocrates tells us: 'She made the Pyreus, as it were, a common mart in the midst of all Greece, where there was such a variety of

necessaries and merchandise that what was difficult to be found in small quantities in other places it was easy to find here in the greatest abundance.' According to Xenophon: 'The grandeur of Athens caused the produce of the whole earth to be sent to that town.'

The artistic manufacture of Athens became celebrated throughout the antique world. At Athens was the High Court of Justice for the settlement of all legal disputes in the Greek colonies, the money-market of the Greek Empire, and the University and Academy of Arts of the whole world. The world's wealth seemed to be centred in Athens. According to Demosthenes, Athens financed the whole Greek Archipelago. Athens began to live largely on foreign labour, on her capital invested abroad, and on the tribute which she received from the islands and colonies in return for protection given. The extreme prosperity of Athens turned the heads of her citizens, who began to believe that Athens was destined by Nature to be, and always to remain, the greatest and the richest commercial and industrial State in the world; for the sober Xenophon informs us in all seriousness:

The Athenians are the only nation among the Greeks and barbarians who can possess wealth; for if other States are rich in timber for shipbuilding or in steel or brass or flax, where can they dispose of these unless they sell them to the rulers of the sea? Our enemies are excluded from the use of the sea, and without labour we enjoy by means of the sea all the earth produces.

Pampered by fortune and misguided by their politicians, the Athenians became a nation of pleasure-loving idlers. Athens was a democracy, and ambitious politicians endeavoured to obtain supporters and to rise to power by flattering, amusing, and bribing the masses. Sumptuous public buildings for the amusement of the masses were erected by the State; theatrical performances, after having been gratuitous, became a source of income to the citizens, who received a remuneration for the time spent in enjoying themselves. Honorary appointments were converted into salaried ones, and these were so enormously increased that a large portion of the populace received bribes in form of a salary. Official positions were distributed by lot. Citizens were paid even for attendance at the assembly of the people. According to Aristotle, twenty thousand citizens lived on the contributions paid by the allied and subject States. Gratis distributions of corn and other food for gaining popularity and votes were common. Thus Athens was corrupted, and became filled with idlers whose only aim in life it was to live well without work and to be amused, who did not know the word 'duty,' and who claimed the privilege of idleness and ease as a right, but who objected to work, to paying taxes, and to serving their country in war. Foreigners took the place of Athenians in the army and fleet, and the contributions of the tributaries had to be greatly increased in order to feed and amuse the clamorous idlers of Athens, who subsisted on

foreign corn, agriculture being neglected. The Crimea supplied Athens with grain, and garrisons at the Dardanelles ensured the regularity of the food supply. According to Demosthenes, Athens imported more grain than any other nation. Athens was the corn-market of the world. Nowhere in the world was bread cheaper than in Athens.

Sparta, the great military land Power, became jealous of the wealth of Athens, and began to look with contempt upon the Athenians who refused to fight for their country. The Spartans thought that Athens ill-deserved her prosperity, and resolved to capture it by war. The terrible Peloponnesian war was, according to Thucydides, caused chiefly by Sparta's commercial jealousy. Political intrigues and divisions, the necessity to pursue a popular though unwise policy, the self-indulgence of the citizens, and their reliance rather on their wealth than on their weapons caused the defeat of Athens. Athens lost the rule of the sea, her supremacy in trade, and her colonies. Her tributaries and her foreign debtors ceased to pay tribute and interest when Athens had fallen from her great position. Her vast wealth disappeared; Athens declined and decayed.

During the Peloponnesian war, which devastated the mainland of Greece, Rhodes had remained neutral, and she had captured much trade whilst that terrible struggle was in progress. Thus, through the fortune of war, the Rhodians, who had been but a small nation, became a great commercial State. Rhodes was excellently situated for carrying on the trade between Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, and between Greece and Italy. Besides, Rhodes had roomy harbours, she was reputed to possess the best sailors of antiquity, her citizens were cultured, progressive, diligent, energetic, and prudent, and she had excellent sea-laws, upon which those of Rome were modelled. Thus commercial and maritime supremacy in the eastern Mediterranean fell to Rhodes. According to Polybius, she ruled the sea. Rhodes became the successor of Athens, the wealthiest State of Greece, and one of the foremost centres of culture and learning. Cicero and Pompey studied at Rhodes, and Caesar was captured by pirates when on the way to the university of the world.

In the centre and west of the Mediterranean Carthage was supreme; she ruled the sea as absolutely as Rome ruled the land, and she became the world's manufacturer. Her navy was considered invincible, and her traders knew no rivals. Carthage, as Phœnicia before her, pursued a profitable policy—that is, a policy profitable to her ruling class of merchants and bankers, who cared only for immediate cash profits, and these became immensely wealthy. Carthage neglected her agriculture and her army, trusting for her defence to her navy and to her money-bags, as Phœnicia had done before her. Sicily provided Carthage with grain, and Spain was her India whence she drew her wool for her vast textile industry, and copper, silver,

gold, and precious stones. Rome, poor, warlike, and ambitious, envied Carthage for her wealth, and despised her for her effeminacy and cowardice. The Romans invaded Sicily and Spain, threatened simultaneously Carthage's food supply and wealth, and raised the slaves against her. Carthage had to fight for her existence. War to the death became inevitable between the two countries. The Romans built a fleet on the model of a stranded Carthaginian vessel and manned it with soldiers. Owing to the ingenious invention of grappling-irons, made by Duilius, the Roman general, Rome succeeded in destroying the fleets of Carthage. After a lengthy and desperate struggle the poor but warlike nation defeated with its national army the mercenaries of its wealthy but unwarlike opponent. Carthage was destroyed.

Cicero summed up the policy of all military Powers, and of Rome in particular, in the words: 'Is any State that is known to be rich allowed to enjoy peace? Or have the generals of Rome ever permitted a wealthy State to live in quiet?' When Rome had destroyed Carthage the wealth of the world lay at her feet. The Greeks were, according to Aristotle, by nature fitted to rule the world 'had they been happily united under a single Government,' but their disunion proved fatal to them. When Rome had vanquished Carthage she ruled the world both politically and economically. It is true that the Romans were by nature peasants and soldiers, but wealth and trade are apt to fall not to the ablest, but to the strongest, for Power is Wealth. Rome swept the wealth of the world into Italy with an iron broom, Roman merchants were preferentially treated by law throughout her dominions, and Rome obtained commercial and maritime supremacy.

After having been a kingdom and a veiled aristocracy, Rome became a democracy. Her politicians competed for the votes of the people, and success at elections fell, as it usually does, not to the ablest, but to the most unscrupulous and to the highest bidder. Appealing to the lowest instincts of the masses, the politicians bought support with bribes. The populace was encouraged and taught to live in idleness on doles and charity. Some democratic statesmen made themselves popular by giving to the people gratuitous performances in gigantic circuses, others by giving them cheap food, which the subject nations were compelled to provide. The free peasantry of Italy, being unable to compete with their grain with slave-grown foreign corn, sold under cost price, were ruined. The once fruitful Campagna, after having been a grazing-ground, became a desert. Agricultural land in Italy was either converted into pasture, which required hardly any labour, or tilled by slaves. The sturdy country population was driven into the towns and decayed in the slums. Rome became completely dependent upon foreign food. Tacitus wrote: 'Formerly Italy exported supplies for the legions to

distant provinces, and Italy is not by any means a barren country. But the nation prefers cultivating Egypt and Africa, and the existence of the Roman people is entrusted to ships and to the dangers of the sea.' Periodically Rome was visited by famine, and poverty and starvation were alarmingly prevalent in the wealthiest town of the world. Quintilian complained: 'Whilst we are selling to the neighbouring nations in the pursuit of a profitable policy, we have neglected all regard for public safety, and, having emptied our store abroad, have brought distress upon ourselves at home.' Rome lived on her foreign investments. Cicero exclaimed: 'Rome is dependent upon the revenues of Asia. The public credit of Rome and the circulation of money in the Forum is connected with it.' The mighty Roman Empire had allowed its foundation to decay.

Town and country are interdependent, and nourish one another, the former providing manufactures, the latter food, and the poverty of the one necessarily brings about in the end the poverty of the other. " Towns cannot live by themselves. The population of Rome could not make a living when, through the decay of agriculture, one-half of the home market had been destroyed, whilst the number of men had not diminished. Therefore, notwithstanding the cheapness of food, extreme poverty and distress were permanent in Rome. Notwithstanding its cheapness, food was found to be too dear by those who could not obtain employment and by those who would not work, and who were encouraged in their idleness by reckless demagogues striving after power, and anxious for popular support. Instead of stopping the influx of foreign corn and repopulating the devastated country districts, the Roman demagogues, pursuing a popular policy, and wishing to keep their electors in hand and dependent upon their bounty, continued their demoralising policy of doles. In 123 B.C. Caius Gracchus reduced the price of corn to about one-third its natural price, at which the head of every family could purchase it from the Government stores. In course of time further reductions took place, and at last gratuitous distributions of corn on a vast scale were instituted. In Cæsar's time 320,000 people were in receipt of gratis corn. Even that was found insufficient. In the third century after Christ gratis distributions of corn were followed by gratis distributions of bread, and these were followed by gratis distributions of meat, oil, salt, wine, &c. The population of Rome consisted of wealthy merchants and idlers, and of a hungry mob living on charity. The strength of Rome had been sacrificed to the Moloch of cheapness and popularity. Nowhere in the world was corn cheaper than in Rome; nowhere was distress greater. The policy of the Roman statesman was summed up in two words—cheap food. A bad harvest would cause a revolution. In the words of Tacitus, ' Alexandria was the key to Egypt, and by blocking up

that plentiful corn country all Italy could very easily be reduced to starvation.' The Roman army was recruited from the wretched slum proletariat which possessed neither stamina nor patriotism, neither the sense of duty nor that of discipline and subordination. The Roman army became an armed mob. Tiberius Gracchus complained: 'The wild beasts of Italy have their dens, but our brave soldiers possess nothing except air and light. Tramps and beggars are the defenders of their country, and the masters of the universe have not a foot of ground they can call their own.' Soon the wretched slum proletariat was no longer fit either to work for its own support or to fight for its country, being no longer willing to exchange the pleasure and idleness of town for a military life or a life spent in honest labour. Rome had to rely on foreign workers and on foreign mercenaries. German soldiers garrisoned the capital, and Dutchmen guarded the emperors. Rome, rotten to the core, had become a nation composed of capitalists and paupers, defended by her money-bags. The barbarians attacked Rome, and the *giganti* Roman Empire fell to pieces like a house of cards.

The centre of the Roman Empire was removed to Constantinople. Constantinople became the heiress of Rome's power and of Rome's policy and traditions. Through her matchless geographical position and as centre of the still large East Roman Empire, Constantinople became exceedingly wealthy. The world had to feed Constantinople, and Constantinople did an enormous trade in food and those articles which the hosts of its idle citizens required. The masses of Constantinople could give power by their votes. Therefore they were corrupted with bribes by the ambitious. 'Panem et circenses' was the cry of the populace in Constantinople as it had been in Rome. Parties were formed round the favourites of the theatre. Constantinople lived on its capital and on foreign tribute, on contributions exacted by force, and on the interest of money lent by her capitalists to productive nations. Constantinople had to be defended by foreigners against her enemies. When the Turks stormed the degenerate town in 1453, ten out of the twelve commanders on the walls were foreigners. Italians and other foreign soldiers had done most of the fighting.

In the eighth century a new world-power, the Arabs, had arisen and had rapidly conquered Asia Minor, the whole of North Africa, and Spain. Power is wealth. Commercial and maritime supremacy may quickly be gained by the sword. The Arabs, possessing some of the richest portions of the globe, embarked upon trade with the productions of their vast empire, and soon their commerce embraced the whole known world. Arab merchants traded from China to Sweden. Baghdad became the centre of the world's trade and of the world's wealth. During the Middle Ages the great Arab towns were the centres of a new civilisation. The foremost universities and the

largest libraries in the world were those of the Arabs ; the best doctors, the greatest lawyers, the foremost engineers, the leading architects and artists were followers of the Prophet. Monuments of the power, wealth, and genius of the Arabs may be found throughout Spain and the Orient, and when these are destroyed, words such as admiral, frigate, magazine, tariff, tare, bazaar, and numerous others will remain a lasting monument to the greatness of the Arabs and witnesses of their commercial and maritime supremacy.

The Arab nations lacked the sense of solidarity, and they were destroyed one by one by the nations of Europe. The Crusaders broke the Arab power in the East, the Spaniards broke it in the West. With the greatness of the Arab Empire disappeared its world-wide trade and its culture.

The Crusaders were transported to the Holy Land by sea, and the Italian sea towns became wealthy and powerful in transporting millions of men and horses to and fro. At an early date the Italian coast towns had stipulated that they should be given trading facilities and settlements of their own in all places occupied by the Crusaders. A vast trade sprang up between Europe and the East. The Crusaders had been introduced to the productions of the East, and a demand for Oriental spices, sugar, glass ware, pottery, silk, tapestry, metal ware, arms, &c., arose throughout Europe, and the Italian coast towns hastened to supply the articles wanted. A lively trade arose between East and West. Caravans coming from the interior of Asia and Africa brought Oriental wares to the coast of the Mediterranean, whence they were fetched by Italian merchants who sent them towards the north of Europe either *via* Gibraltar or across the Alps and down the Rhine. Italy lay on the high road of the world's traffic, and, owing to the constant stream of merchandise and of wealth, the Italian coast towns and Florence, Milan, Verona, Lucca, Augsburg, Nuremberg, Strasburg, Cologne and others flourished greatly.

Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Amalfi transported the Crusaders and their belongings, and carried on the trade between Europe and the Orient. Of these four town Republics Amalfi was in the beginning the greatest. In the ninth century Amalfi, which had fifty thousand inhabitants, ruled the sea and outshone all her competitors in wealth, industry, culture, and learning. The *Tabula Amalfitana*, the celebrated sea laws of that town, became the sea laws of the Mediterranean ; Flavio Gioja, an Amalfitan, introduced the mariner's compass ; Amalfitan coins freely circulated throughout the Orient. Pisa, Amalfi's greatest competitor, became jealous of Amalfi's prosperity. A war between the two Republics ended in the victory of the Pisans, who sacked Amalfi in 1135, and Amalfi became, what it is still, a miserable village. Few people know nowadays that Amalfi ever ruled the sea.

The destruction of her great rival gave commercial and maritime supremacy to Pisa, which became a most flourishing town. Rapidly expanding, Pisa conquered and colonised Corsica, Sardinia, and the Balearic Islands. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, during the time of her splendour, she built the magnificent Duomo begun in 1063, the Baptisterio, begun in 1153, the leaning tower, begun in 1174, and the Campo Santo, begun in 1203, which are still objects of universal admiration. 'Those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword.' Genoa, Pisa's mighty rival, wishing to crush her great competitor, frequently made war upon Pisa, and at last succeeded in destroying her power in the terrible battle of Meloria, in which no fewer than 16,000 Pisans were killed or made prisoners. Genoa became mistress of the sea, and Pisa decayed utterly. Pisa, which in the eleventh century had 150,000 inhabitants and which then was, perhaps, the largest town in Europe, became a poverty-stricken village.

When Amalfi and Pisa had been destroyed, Genoa and Venice had the Mediterranean trade to themselves. Friction occurred between the two competitors, and again war had to decide whether commercial and maritime supremacy, wealth, and power should fall to the one or to the other. During three centuries Genoa and Venice were at war, and at last Venice succeeded by a mighty effort in destroying her great rival. At the beginning of the fifteenth century Venice was at the height of her power. She ruled the sea, she conquered and colonised the islands and the coasts of the Mediterranean, and she became the head of a vast colonial empire and the centre of the world's trade, the world's wealth, the world's culture, and the world's art. The sea was covered with Venetian ships, manned by no fewer than 50,000 sailors.

During two thousand years civilisation had progressed along the shores of the Mediterranean, but the Arabs and Italians had introduced trade and culture, arts and sciences to the countries of Northern Europe, and new centres of civilisation began to spring up on the savage shores of the North Sea and the Baltic. Under the fostering care of enlightened princes, manufacturing industries grew up in Flanders and Brabant which provided Muscovy, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Germany with textile fabrics and other wares in exchange for raw produce, such as timber, corn, wool, pitch, tar, hemp, furs, furnished by these nations. Lubeck, Bremen, and Hamburg, lying in the centre of the northern trade route, acquired commercial and maritime eminence. The Hanseatic League arose. The Italian merchants found it difficult to trade directly with the countries of Northern Europe because the imperfect state of navigation made it impossible for them to reach the Baltic in a single season. Therefore they agreed with the Hanseatic merchants that a town lying half-way between Italy and the Baltic towns should be made the

market for the exchange of northern and of Italian and Oriental productions and an international storehouse. Bruges was fixed upon, and Bruges became by far the greatest and the wealthiest town of Northern Europe. Venice in the South and Bruges in the North handled the trade of the world. Venice and Bruges were the two poles round which the commercial world revolved. The prosperity of these two towns seemed to rest on the most solid basis.

Through Vasco da Gama's circumnavigation of the Cape of Good Hope and the discovery of the sea route to India, the trade of the world was suddenly completely changed. When it was found that it was far cheaper to fetch the productions of the Orient *via* the Cape of Good Hope than to fetch them from the southern shores of the Mediterranean after a tedious land voyage, the commercial and maritime supremacy of Venice was destroyed. The current of the world's trade altered its course. Venice became deserted, and Lisbon, lying half-way on the new trade route between East and West, became the greatest emporium of the world's trade and the heir of Venice. The Venetian Republic offered to buy the whole of the Oriental goods brought to Portugal and not wanted for Portuguese consumption in order to retain at least the second-hand trade in the produce of the Orient. That offer was refused. Venice had to live on her accumulated capital, and, being unable to extend the basis of her wealth and power and to keep pace with the progress of the other nations of Europe, she gradually decayed, for no nation can live on its wealth invested abroad.

Flanders and Brabant were the Lancashire of Europe. Arras, Ypres, Mechlin, Ghent, Brussels, Liège, and Namur provided the world with manufactures of every kind, and Bruges, lying in the centre of that wealthy district, was at the same time a huge manufacturing town and a great trading centre. In the fifteenth century Bruges had 200,000 inhabitants, and was far larger than London or Paris. However, Flanders and Brabant, though they possessed a most fruitful soil, had neglected their agricultural for the more profitable manufacturing industries. According to the 'Libell of English Policie,' written in 1436, these towns produced only bread enough to last for one month. The democratic Governments of these wealthy towns pursued a popular policy, sacrificing to ease and luxury, to popularity, and to the pursuit of commercial gain the strength of the country, and neglected arms. The Dukes of Burgundy made war upon them. Being disunited among themselves and divided within by party strife, these mighty towns were easily subdued one by one by force or were starved into surrender. A large part of the population of Flanders and Brabant, being unable to make a living in their declining country, emigrated. Ypres, which at the time of her glory had had 200,000 inhabitants, became a village, and the

emigrants from Flanders and Brabant laid the foundation of the great industries of Holland, Germany, France, and England. The decline of the industries of Flanders and Brabant brought about the decline of Bruges. The leading merchants of that town migrated to Antwerp, and, through the fortune of war, Antwerp became the commercial and financial centre of Northern Europe.

The commercial supremacy of Antwerp was short-lived. The Dutch and Belgian Netherlands, which had fallen under the rule of Spain, rose in revolt against Spain in consequence of the cruel religious persecution of Philip the Second, and of Alva, his lieutenant in the Netherlands. The Dutch Netherlands, being comparatively poor and possessing a very warlike population, fought bravely and expelled the Spaniards. The Belgian Netherlands, with their enormous towns, offered but a feeble and futile resistance, for the town population is better at shouting than at fighting. Through the pusillanimity of the popular Government and the cowardice of the large industrial proletariat, Antwerp was conquered and plundered and the traders of that town fled to Amsterdam for safety. Flanders and Brabant were ruined by the Spaniards, and the population fled from the unhappy country and took their industries to neighbouring Holland.

The war between Holland and Spain, which Alva's persecutions had kindled, lasted almost uninterruptedly during eighty years. According to the current theories of English political economists, peace is the greatest interest of all nations; war is ruinous to all. History, which disproves so many idle theories, teaches us that there are ruinous and profitable wars, and the Eighty Years' War against Spain, though ruinous to Spain, was exceedingly profitable to the Dutch. At the beginning of the war Spain and Portugal possessed the greatest colonial empire in the world. Pope Alexander the Sixth had, in 1493, divided the New World between Spain and Portugal. Spain and Portugal had conquered the New World, and when, in 1580, Portugal was conquered by Spain, Spain became the possessor of the whole of the New World. Before the outbreak of the Eighty Years' War, Spain was the richest nation in all the world, and the strongest on land and sea. At the end of that war the industries of Flanders and Brabant, and the wealth of the Spanish-Portuguese Empire and its most valuable colonies, had passed into the hands of the Dutch. Besides, the Dutch, having chased the Spanish and Portuguese ships from the ocean, had conquered the rule of the sea. By the sword the Dutch had won industrial, commercial, and maritime supremacy the world over. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the Dutch had, according to Sir Walter Raleigh and many other reliable writers, a greater merchant marine than all other nations combined. New York, then called New Amsterdam, was a Dutch settlement;

Brazil was conquered by the Dutch from the Portuguese ; India was dominated by Dutchmen ; the Spice Islands, the most valuable points on the African coast and the Cape of Good Hope, were Dutch. The world was dotted with Dutch naval stations. The Dutch possessed a world-empire similar to the British world-empire of to-day. They were the wealthiest, the most industrious, and the most powerful nation existing. The New World might have become Dutch instead of Anglo-Saxon. The religious persecutions and the Thirty Years' War on the continent of Europe, and the stormy rule of Charles the First and the Civil War in England, destroyed the industries and trade of Europe and strengthened still further the Dutch monopoly of manufacturing and trade. The trade of England and France was carried in Dutch bottoms. Amsterdam financed the world. The whole world was tributary to Holland.

England's commercial and maritime greatness is of very recent date. At the time when Flanders and Brabant were prosperous manufacturing countries, England was a third-rate Power and a purely agricultural and pastoral country, whence Flanders and Brabant drew the wool they needed. The trade of England was carried on by Hanseatic merchants called 'Easterlings,' who have given the name to the coin of the realm, and by Lombards, whose arms may be seen outside every pawnshop. The far-reaching trading privileges of these foreigners, which were similar to those enjoyed now by Englishmen in China, were withdrawn by Queen Elizabeth, who wished to foster the English industries. At the time when the Dutch carried on the trade of the world England possessed hardly any ships and hardly any fishing industry. The greatest British maritime industry was piracy.

Proud of her wealth, and confiding in her wealth and her semi-insular position, which could be made completely insular by piercing the dykes, Holland neglected her army and those industries which raise food and warlike men. Her agriculture hardly sufficed to nourish one-eighth of the inhabitants, and she allowed her mighty fisheries, whence she drew her seamen, to be captured by foreigners. Her merchant statesmen followed a utilitarian policy most profitable to themselves. The nation was hopelessly divided by party feuds. Believing that no country would venture to attack a country which had defeated the Spanish Empire, the Dutch allowed their navy to lose its supremacy, believing that they could in time of need improvise a navy with their unlimited wealth and latent resources. Cromwell, seeing that Holland was almost disarmed, and divided within, attacked her in 1652. His 'colonels at sea,' Blake, Dean, Monk, and Popham, defeated with their infantry the ablest Dutch admirals and seamen. Cromwell's navigation laws crippled the commerce of the Dutch and created the greatness of the English

merchant marine. Further attacks by England and by France destroyed the maritime and commercial supremacy of the Dutch.

In 1661 Colbert began to direct the economic policy of France. France was a poor agricultural country, Holland was a rich industrial and commercial State, and Colbert resolved to capture a large part of the industrial and commercial wealth of the Dutch. Hitherto France had levied customs duties for revenue purposes only. Colbert introduced fiscal protection and transferred a large part of the Dutch industries from Dutch to French soil. Colbert's policy was copied by all other nations, whilst the Netherlands followed the policy of free trade. All Europe made fiscal war upon the Dutch industries, and these decayed utterly.

The Netherlands rapidly declined. France and England, equally strong, desired to become great commercial, maritime, and colonial nations at the cost of the Dutch, and very soon they fell to fighting over the great Dutch inheritance. Competition between English and French traders and between the English and French Governments, for trade, ships, and colonies, led to war. During more than a century, from the time of Louis the Fourteenth to that of Napoleon the First, England and France fought for the rule of the sea, for colonial empire, and for the trade of the world. The overthrow of Napoleon gave to England commercial and maritime supremacy the world over. England's commercial and industrial supremacy and her colonial empire were won by the sword and by the protective policy of her rulers.

During the wars of the Revolution and the Napoleonic wars the whole continent of Europe was devastated, many Continental Governments became bankrupt, the industries and commerce of England's competitors were destroyed; England only had peace at home, and became exceedingly wealthy through the disappearance of all her competitors and the consequent monopoly of England in trade and industry. England became the manufacturer, trader, shipper, banker, and financier of the world. The whole world was pawned to Englishmen.

'Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall.' In the 'forties of the last century England produced more coal, more cotton goods, more iron, and she had more money, more miles of railway, and more ships than the rest of the world. English merchants began to believe that, as Mr. Cobden put it, England was destined by Nature to be, and always to remain, the workshop of the world, and being in power, they threw away the economic and political defences of their country. Since then the glory and greatness of England have much diminished. Industrially, commercially, and financially, England has greatly declined. Her commercial and maritime supremacy is seriously threatened by the United States

and Germany, who have been advancing with giant strides whilst Great Britain has stood still. What will be the future of Great Britain and the British Empire? Will Great Britain learn the lesson of history? The eleventh hour has arrived.

The history of three thousand years teaches us that all the good things of this world, land and riches, commerce and shipping, are not to the peaceful and to the feeble, but to the warlike and to the strong; not to the sluggard, armed with a 'scientific' formula pronounced by a learned theorist, but to energetic and ambitious men of action, armed with common sense; that wealth and power can be preserved only by military strength; that wealth is a bad substitute for power; that power may easily be converted into wealth, but that money-bags do not defend themselves; that strength is better than wealth; that the neglect of the army and the decay of agriculture have been fatal to all great commercial States of the past, from Phœnicia to Holland; that huge towns devour the strength of the country.

Great Britain has allowed her agriculture to decay and she has, at the bidding of interested manufacturers and traders and of crazy theorists, erected the mightiest economic fabric the world has seen upon a single pillar. That pillar stands upon foreign ground, and foreign nations are engaged in sawing through that pillar. The British Empire can be preserved only as long as the British fleet is supreme, and the British fleet can remain supreme only as long as Great Britain can afford to maintain a larger fleet than any other nation. Great Britain is no longer the richest nation in the world. The outlook for Great Britain and her colonies is very serious and threatening, for might is right in international politics. The law of the survival of the fittest and strongest, which rules the whole animal and vegetable creation, applies with equal force to man and to his political associations.

Great Britain and the British Empire stand at the parting of the ways. The greatest danger to Great Britain is her weakness. Great Britain must have strength commensurate with the extent of her possessions, or she will perish. The British Empire is merely a geographical expression. In its unorganised state it is as little an empire as was the Dutch world-empire or the Phœnician world-empire of old.

The greatest States of all times have perished because they have not acted in accordance with the spirit of the times. Unless Great Britain reforms herself, adapts herself to modern conditions, abandons her insane and pseudo-liberal policy of drift, neglect, and mammonism, miscalled non-interference, individualism, and free trade; unless she husband and develops her resources and increases her rapidly-ebbing national strength by reconstituting her agriculture and making the population warlike and prepared for war; and unless the British Empire

is unified—for only the united and organised strength of the whole of the Empire can suffice to defend it—Great Britain, and with her the British Empire, may, by the inexorable law of History and of Nature, follow the way which Phœnicia, Carthage, Athens, Rome, Constantinople, the Arab Empire, Amalfi, Pisa, Genoa, Venice and the Dutch Empire have gone in the past.

J. ELLIS BARKER.

LIBERALISM AND LABOUR

THE General Election of last January was hailed by many as the beginning of a new era in English politics. No feature of that upheaval seemed likely to exercise more disturbance than the arrival of an Independent Labour Party in the House of Commons. For the nine succeeding months public attention has been concentrated upon its members and methods. From the first it was evident to those who saw below the surface that this was a party in the making rather than a party made; that its advent as a conscious and substantial force in the House of Commons was but the commencement of a development whose end no man can foresee.

Two subjects especially have occupied the attention of those who were concerned in a wider outlook than that of the political game. The one was the relationship of this new party to the Liberal Party, which had suddenly returned to power in such enormous strength. The other was the conflict within this party between those who desired a test of class and those who desired a test of principle. In the last month both these questions have flared up into rather unexpected violence. Two Liberal whips, in a meeting in Scotland, took upon themselves, somewhat unaccountably, to throw down a challenge of war. The one defied 'a body of malignant wreckers who would destroy the Liberal Party if they could, and build up in its place an exacting tyranny under which he hoped the working man would never fall.' The other promised 'very little quarter' to those who were elected in part by Liberal votes and yet often refused to go flit to the Liberal lobby. The Scottish Liberal Association declared its intention of fighting at every election any one who declared himself a Socialist. The Liberal newspapers endeavoured with some anxiety to cast oil on the troubled waters. The Tory newspapers hailed with glee the first evidences of a split within the dominant majority. Cabinet Ministers and other lesser speakers indulged in pleasant periods concerning the impossibility of Socialism, and the desirability of Liberals carrying forward a policy of social reform.

On the other hand, within the ranks of Labour itself, the observer has contemplated the somewhat indecent quarrel centring round the personality of Mr. Richard Bell; and the remarkable figures of the

voting of the miners whether they should or should not affiliate with the Labour Representation Committee.

Nine out of ten Liberal members of Parliament would probably regret the language of their whips and desire to avoid all evidences of open conflict with Independent Labour. The Liberal Press has been supporting Mr. Bell against his assailants. At best these are but incidents, regrettable or otherwise, but not vital. They may precipitate, they cannot transform, the large forces which are working for change. A right apprehension of these forces is the first necessity of political prophecy.

The old Labour member was a representative of a certain trade; generally an official of the Union, who was sent by that trade and Union into Parliament, definitely to look after the interest of its members. The coal-miners would send a coal-miner to protect the interest of those who worked in coal mines. The railway men would send the secretary of their Union to safeguard the welfare of railway servants. These men were, for the most part, Liberals in politics. There was no particular reason why they should be so. Their unions consisted of Conservatives as well as Liberals, and probably in many elections, in the more established and opulent unions, the actual votes of the members would have shown a majority on the Conservative side. The most efficient of all trade unions, in fact, the National Union of Teachers, accepted the political necessities of a double party system; and maintained two representatives, a Liberal and a Conservative, in order that no member should feel aggrieved at his subscriptions going to support a political opponent. For the rest, the old Labour men were sturdy Radicals. They formed a kind of fringe of the Liberal Party, made up of those who had actual experience in the life of the artisan. On all general questions they tramped cheerily through the Liberal lobbies. On special disputes they voted for the interests of those who supported them. The representatives of the miners who demanded the eight-hours day voted for an eight-hours day; the representatives of the miners who objected to an eight-hours day voted against an eight-hours day. Their chief utility was in Committee of Supply, especially in such matters as the Home Office vote, where the discussion often became a kind of technical debate upon 'spindles' and 'shafts' and 'shunters' between the Government officials and the representatives of particular affected trades. They were Trade Unionists and they believed in Trade Unionism. They did not especially concern themselves with general questions of poverty, or of the remedies for poverty. Sometimes those with particular qualifications would voice the needs of the disinherited classes. Mr. Crooks, for example, in the last Parliament, made quite a number of speeches, enlivened by humorous and pathetic anecdote, concerning the hard life of the poor. Most of those who heard him in Parliament wept. Members of both parties would walk across

afterwards and shake him warmly by the hand. Nothing particular was done. There was no obvious reason why anything should be done. No one expected that anything would be done. The great political parties went on their way, carrying out their own political ideals with greater or less efficiency; each convinced in its own mind that it was the party to which the masses of the country had most reason to be grateful for the advancement of their true interests. In the 1900 election Mr. Chamberlain could declare that the presence of 'Labour members' in the House had done nothing to advance the cause of Social Reform; and although the statement excited indignation it provoked no conclusive reply. But everybody felt that Parliament was the better for having such men amongst them. Liberal members could point out to their Trade Union constituents that they were of the same party as these respected Trade Unionists. The men themselves were of the salt of the earth, and would have done credit to any assembly. And occasionally, in 1880, in 1886, in 1892, one of them would be offered a minor post in a Liberal Government.

Suddenly into these pleasant time-honoured courses entered the new Labour party; pushful, aggressive, organised, independent. Its money and its votes have been largely provided by the Trade Unions through the action of the 'Labour Representation Committee'—a triumph of skilled organisation. But its energy and driving force have been given by the little group who call themselves the 'Independent Labour Party,' whose aim is not so much the welfare of Trade Unionism as the advancement of a definite policy of social reform leading in the direction of Collectivism. These men are those whom the Master of Elibank has termed 'malignant wreckers.' Wreckers they may be; 'malignant' would seem to be a strong term to be used against men who have made no secret from the beginning of their intentions; who from the beginning have fought Liberals as violently as they have fought Conservatives. If Liberals had had their own way, none of these particular politicians would to-day be in the House of Commons. Mr. Macdonald was badly beaten by two Liberals in a double-membered constituency in 1900. Mr. Jowett has been opposed by the Bradford Liberals in years of bitter controversy, and finally defeated both a Liberal and a Conservative in a triangular contest. Mr. Barnes at Glasgow came in at the head of the poll against a Conservative ex-Minister and a Liberal opponent. Mr. Keir Hardie found a Liberal put up against him last January and beat him by over 2,000 votes. Mr. Snowden at Blackburn in two elections lost, no opportunity of pouring his scorn upon the Liberals and the Nonconformists, and finally was returned, with a Conservative colleague, beating the Liberal by over a thousand votes. These men have never been Liberals. They have never pretended to be Liberals. They have never supported a Liberal on a public platform, and never asked for Liberal support on their platforms. They honestly disbelieve in the intention of

the Liberal party actively to carry out the policy which they desire. They have climbed into Parliament despite bitter Liberal opposition. 'Cet animal est très méchant,' runs Buffon's verdict on the rhinoceros. 'Quand on l'attaque il se défend.' And it is a little surprising to find these Socialists scolded by a Liberal whip for not marching with docility through the Liberal lobbies.

But one or two storm centres have been muttering for many months on the horizon. The archaic and undemocratic nature of Parliamentary elections, in the long prevalence of the two-party system, has made it possible for a third candidate to cause considerable annoyance by letting into Parliament a member whom the majority of the constituency would never have chosen. The manifestation of such a deplorable result in the recent Cockermouth by-election was probably the cause of the latest explosion. And many of the older Labour members have confronted with a deepening repugnance the growth of the new 'Labour' party. They see an active propagandism daily developing, especially among the younger men, in their own Unions, designed to squeeze them into joining this new body. They feel the rope tightening round their own necks. They are sometimes angry at the fuss and flattery which the new party has attracted. And they are especially incensed at this party taking upon itself a name which would seem to exclude themselves from the ranks of representative labour.

This name, indeed, has been the greatest source of friction. The party led by Mr. Keir Hardie has had considerable difficulty in finding a satisfactory title for itself. Some members proposed to call it 'the Socialist Party'; but the wisest men within its ranks successfully opposed such a change. Some of its members do not understand what Socialism means. Some understand Socialism and definitely reject it. Some are Socialists, but reluctant to alarm the mass of the English people with a name which has come to have a technical and unpleasant significance. To most of the middle class 'Socialists' are men who have bolted with the municipal funds or with their neighbours' wives; or, if they have not yet done so, would do so on the slightest provocation. Even to the more enlightened a 'Socialist party' too often signifies a party pledged to sudden and violent change, involving confiscation, disturbance of the social order, perhaps revolution. It would cut the world into parallelograms, and equalise the thrifty and the laggard. The Labour party is a party pledged to evolutionary change. There is nothing revolutionary in its immediate policy. The Social Democrats, indeed, of a more austere and uncompromising creed, are never tired of girding at the Socialism of the Labour members, for the lack of this quality of immediate action and for too confident faith in the gradual processes of change.

Under these circumstances the party fell back upon the rather forlorn expedient of calling itself 'the Labour Party.' Immediately they were thrown into collision with the older Labour members on the

Government side of the House. Members of the present Parliament will remember that one of the few really passionate scenes in the past session was that in which this title was challenged from the Government benches. On a technical question of representation on a Committee Mr. Keir Hardie demanded that his party should have a member. The Government whip announced that he had already given a seat on the Committee to a member 'of 'one of the Labour parties.' Those who sat on the Opposition side immediately claimed that they were the only Labour party. The Liberal Trade Unionists, amid the angry approval of the Government supporters, asserted with indignation their right to the claim Labour. Many of them protested that they had for long years toiled for Labour's welfare in the House, and for many years before laboured with their hands in mine or factory.

The thing was a dispute over a name, or rather over an emphasis. On the one side the emphasis was laid less on 'Labour' than on 'party'; on the other less on 'party' than on 'Labour.' The two groups or sections were not in reality comparable. The Labour men on the Liberal side are convinced Radicals; who speak at Liberal meetings and receive the Government whips, and who have no wish in any way to dis sever themselves from the general body of the new majority. The Labour men on the Opposition side are, in the main, Socialists; who repudiate the Liberal whips, and are not allowed to support in public a Liberal candidate, many of whom have been fought by the local Liberals of their constituencies, and who desire above all things to emphasise their independence of both the historic parties.

Within this party and without it, amongst the working men of the cities, especially the Trade Unionists, two forces are fighting for mastery, and the conflict furnishes the key to the friction of the present situation. The one section desires to keep Labour representation as that of a class; the other desires to create a party which shall endorse a programme. The one is committed to the position that working men shall elect working men to the House of Commons. It desires miners to represent miners, postmen to elect postmen, engineers to stand for engineers. If this is not always practicable, it is at least anxious that the skilled artisan class as a whole shall be represented by skilled artisans. Liberals, Conservatives, Socialists, and men indifferent to politics will thus subscribe their united funds in order to send direct representatives of their own class into the House of Commons. There is no reason under this theory why these representatives should be of any one political complexion. A Labour leader fought as a Conservative at Oldham in a recent by-election, and most of the Unions might ultimately adopt the method of the National Union of Teachers and support working men of various parties in Parliament.

The other section desires to create a party inspired by a definite political ideal and pressing forward a definite political programme.

The ideal is Collectivism ; the political programme is reform leading towards Collectivism. In order to avoid the present implication of the term 'Socialist,' I might perhaps call them (in a hideous and barbaric phrase) 'Social Reformists.' These men wish to make a 'Social Reformist' party. They are starting to-day with the support in finance and prestige of the Trade Unions, and they hope to keep the Unions with them. But they have no wish to confine their policy to questions which affect Trade Unionists or their membership to those who work with their hands. They would welcome recruits from all classes of society who will adopt the Social Reformist programme. They have with them the younger members of the Trade Union organisations ; and the struggle to make a party out of the members of all and of none is to-day one of the most momentous struggles of modern politics.

This is the secret of the incident last month which attracted for Mr. Richard Bell so much attention. There was a considerable amount of vituperation and of personality ; but the vituperation and the personality were not relevant to the general situation. The thing was a fight between two principles. Mr. Bell appealed, in the name of his many conspicuous services to the railway men, against 'Socialists,' who, he claimed, were not working men at all, and even made large incomes as practical journalists. He asked his followers to support him against a party which might bring down the son of a lord to stand against one who had been a working guard on the railway. This was a clear enunciation of the class principle. The reply was the assertion that the railway men, as a whole, endorsed the 'Social Reformist' policy of Mr. Keir Hardie's party and subscribed to that party's funds ; and therefore that their paid representative should be a member of that party, or retire. There are thousands of Conservatives among the railway men ; and the situation would have been essentially the same if Mr. Bell had appealed against the pressure of the new Labour party from a normally Conservative instead of a normally Liberal record. The spectacle of one man fighting a crowd is always an exhilarating one ; and Mr. Bell has fought pluckily, if a little recklessly. But I doubt if, under such circumstances, the sympathy of Liberals with Mr. Bell would have been so conspicuously manifest as in the present instance.

The issue of this internal Labour conflict no man can foresee. It will not be decided to-day or to-morrow. The difficulties are enormous confronting the leaders who are trying to create a new party of ideas. They have to convert Liberal and Conservative Trade Unionists to an abandonment of their own parties and adherence to the party of the 'Social Reformists.' They have to convince Society outside of the sanity and practicability of their proposals. They have to break down a class prejudice which still thinks that navvies should be represented by a navvy, and the boilermakers by a practical engi-

neer. On the other hand, there are very remarkable signs of progress. That the Miners' Federation, despite the opposition of all its old and trusted leaders, should come within ten thousand votes of throwing over their advice and joining the Labour Representation Committee, is in itself significant evidence of change. The newer generation in all the unions are almost all on the side of the Independent Labour leaders. But the prejudice in favour of class representation is still exceedingly strong; and probably for some time to come the candidates of the Labour Representation Committee will be limited to those who, if not artisans and trade unionists, at least can claim to be within calculable distance of support on a weekly wage.

The future of this struggle would seem in part to depend upon the future of another and larger problem. This is the problem of the relationship between the Social Reformists and the Liberal party. Here once again there is a difficulty in terminology. The members of the Liberal party would probably refuse to the thirty members of the new organisation the exclusive title of 'Social Reformists.' 'Are not we keen and eager,' they would say, 'on all social reforms?' 'Are not the perorations of our speeches embroidered with periods concerning the betterment of the poor?' 'Have we not consistently voted in every academic debate for large changes in the amelioration of the condition of the people?' Here, as in the first instance, the question is one of emphasis. It would be quite easy to draw up two programmes, every item of which would be endorsed by both parties. But the attitude of determination and choice in the realisation of these programmes would make a profound chasm in actual political energies. The one might consist of these: the Education Bill, Temperance Reform, One Man One Vote, Reform of the House of Lords, Disestablishment of the Welsh Church, Retrenchment on Naval and Military Expenditure. And for the other we might have the following: Feeding of School Children, Old Age Pensions, Graduation of Income Tax, National Work for the Unemployed, Land Nationalisation.

The difference of the three parties is this: that the official Liberal party would seem to be pushing forward the first whilst giving a general approval to the second; the official Social Reformist party would push forward the second while giving a general approval to the first; and the official Tory party would strenuously resist both.

This difference of emphasis has been marked during the present session. It will become more marked in the immediate future.

The present Government has spent the greater part of Government time in pushing forward its Education Bill through the House of Commons. The Social Reformists, had they been in power, would probably not have brought in an Education Bill at all. They openly flout the debate as a wrangle between rival religious sects which they regard with equal toleration and contempt. One item of that Bill involved the voting of an additional million a year of public money for

the advancement of education. A rough difference between the two points of view is given by the fact that the Liberal Government is devoting that million to the conversion of non-provided into provided schools. The Social Reformists prefer the provided to the unprovided schools; but they have other use for a million of money than this change, and undoubtedly would have used it first for the feeding and physical welfare of the children of the poor.

Again, on the question of retrenchment, a strong Radical wing of the new majority has pressed steadily, at times almost violently, for a large policy of reduction. They have desired reduction in the main for two reasons: the first because they object on principle to money spent on armaments, and would like to reduce armaments quite apart from the saving which such a reduction would involve; the second because they wish to increase the spending power of the people. They are appalled by a Budget of 150 millions, and honestly believe that the private citizens will spend their money better than the nation can spend it for them.

The Social Reformists have been nothing like so anxious to reduce naval and military expenditure; and those especially who represent dockyard and arsenal constituencies have shown no alacrity in pressing for such a policy. They are not convinced that money spent on armaments is any more wasted than money spent on other forms of public and private luxury. And they are not in the least scared by a Budget of 150 millions. They believe that on the whole money is spent better by the community than by individuals. Almost every item of their programme involves an increase in the national or municipal budget. They are told in straight terms that the reforms they desire can only be promoted by money saved upon present extravagance. But, in face of the figures of the national income and its present distribution, they show little willingness to accept unchallenged such a dogma.

The present danger lies in the inevitable contests which must arise in practically every by-election in the great towns. Of this Cockermouth was an example, and the election but hardly avoided in Mid-Glamorgan. It would be absurd to demand that the new party should abandon such magnificent opportunities of propagandism and political advertisement as by-elections can give. Moreover, in all the big cities there are sufficient of the rank and file, enthusiastic for their ideals, who would compel the leaders to press on a contest. It has been commonly accepted that, in the event of certain constituencies becoming vacant last summer by Liberal elevations to the peerage, practically all would have been involved in such three-cornered contests.

Nor, again, is there any possibility of a return to the old conditions which a certain section of moderate Liberals appears to desire—of a Labour party which shall be patronised and applauded and

allowed certain seats where the artisan vote is in a conspicuous majority, but which otherwise shall support with docility the official Liberal candidates. We are destined to a long series of three-cornered by-elections in which, 'under present conditions, it is exceedingly likely that Conservatives will be returned by the votes of the minority of the electors. Such a development may cause anxiety and stimulate anger among those who consider the Conservative party as still the enemy. The reply of the Social Reformists is deliberate and unanswerable. By a tiny constitutional change, already overdue—the introduction of the second ballot into elections—the real desires of a majority can always be assured. So long as the dominant party refuses this change they are open to the charge of trying to coerce men who would desire to vote Labour into voting Liberal, by the threat that otherwise a Tory will be returned.

It is exceedingly difficult to prophesy whether this second ballot would tend to the advantage of Liberalism or of Labour. One of the leaders of the new party, Mr. Keir Hardie, has declared for it. Another, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, has written against it. From the Labour point of view it would undoubtedly stimulate a very large number of three-cornered contests, with all the expense and weariness which such contests involve. On the other hand the idea that Labour would be 'dished' by such a change is completely chimerical. In the Cockermouth contest, for example, it is exceedingly doubtful whether with the second ballot Mr. Smillie would not have beaten Captain Guest. For a large number of working men appear to have voted for the latter, influenced by the argument that if they did not, the Tory, not the Labour man, would be returned. Nor can it be affirmed that the change might not benefit even the Conservative party. If the spirit of the Master of Elibank and the Scottish Association is to be carried into the warfare in the constituencies, it is exceedingly probable that in many cases the feeling thus engendered would cause the minority Labour vote in the second ballot to be given, not to the Liberal, but to the Tory candidate. No party stands certainly to gain. But, with the break-up of the two-party system in England, the time calls for this immediate change if the democratic nature of the English electoral system is to be preserved.

Vulgarisation and wild words are the least efficient way of meeting the situation. The leaders of the Independent Labour party, in their persistent and rather monotonous attack on Liberalism, often tend to exasperate those who still believe the Liberal party to be a great progressive asset in the country. Those who read the *Labour Leader* or the *Clarion* may be excused if they sometimes refuse to 'take it lying down,' and hit back with some violence. But all such methods of widening the breach are entirely regrettable in face of the enormous work which remains to be done in England, and the still entrenched and puissant forces of the reaction. The true friends of progress

would appear to have been that minority in the Scottish Association which proposed, as an amendment to the motion of defiance, that the duty of the Liberal party is to continue its policy of social amelioration.

Upon this policy depends its future development or decline. The discontent now being manifest is largely due to the fact that this work has been limited and impelled, and indeed can scarcely be said yet to have begun. In the present Parliament social reform has not got beyond its rhetorical stage. One-sixth, perhaps one-fifth, of its life has passed without any definite Government measure being advanced dealing directly with those problems of poverty which are the vital questions before England of the twentieth century.

The Government is passing an Education Bill. It is going to pass a Temperance Bill. These are middle-class measures for which working men as a whole care nothing at all. Its rural policy up till now consists of the adoption of a Land Tenure Bill which can only benefit the middle-class farmer, who is generally a Tory, bitterly opposed to small holdings, and the worst sweeter of the agricultural labourer. It is passing a Workmen's Compensation Bill which is a continuance and expansion of the Conservative measure of 1897. It is passing a Trade Disputes Bill which is an attempt to put the trade unions back into the position in which they were placed by the Conservative Government of 1875. Neither of these is anything more than an inevitable measure; the price which any party would have had to pay for the support of the big towns; which would have been passed by any party which had come into power after the general election. The failure of the Tories in the matter of trade disputes—a failure which the ablest of them to-day bitterly regret—was not due to a disagreement of principle but to an absence of political sagacity. Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour would have no determination to refuse what Mr. Disraeli had willingly granted. But the one was concerned with Tariff Reform and the other with the saving of the party from its ravages; in some blind fashion the time drifted by without remedy; and at last they faced the election without knowledge, and apparently without warning, that by their failure to reverse Taff Vale every Conservative trade unionist had for the moment been converted into a Radical or a Socialist voter.

For the rest, a Committee appointed to consider the Feeding of School Children has issued a report which social reformers will regard as timid and unsatisfactory. A Committee on the Graduation of the Income Tax will report next year. Those who care primarily for social progress have recognised the enormous difficulties of the Liberal party, huddled into office without due preparation, and living, as it were, from hand to mouth during the life of the new Parliament. They have been content to wait in hope of better things. They have waited—acquiescent—for a session. This coming year is going to be

a critical time in the history of present politics. The labourer in the country wants direct access to the land. The workman in the towns wants better houses; more leisure; a fairer chance for his children; some security against unemployment and old age. I think that if the Liberal party fails to satisfy these demands it will dwindle and presently fall into impotence; as the Liberal parties on the Continent have dwindled and fallen into impotence; because they failed rightly to interpret the signs of the time.

Never was a situation more interesting; never, I should think, more uncertain. Elements which stand habitually outside the field of political enterprise have crashed into the arena and upset the calculations of party management. It is impossible to foresee how far these elements will turn all awry the best-laid schemes of statesmen and initiate a new epoch in the history of reform. With the internal strife in the ranks of Labour itself the outsider has no concern. He can but contemplate, with sympathy somewhat similar to that of the European survey of the Russian upheaval, a struggle in which any active intervention would be of exceedingly doubtful value. The majority of social reformers would probably welcome the triumph of principles rather than of class. They might indeed prefer the election of 150 bricklayers and one barrister to the House of Commons to that of 150 barristers and one bricklayer. But they are not convinced that bricklaying provides any inherent faculty of training for political intelligence, or that such a choice would be any guarantee for the advancement of the reforms which they desire.

On the other hand, those, within the Liberal party and outside it, who believe that human well-being can be increased at the present time by progress in a Collectivist direction, will not be deterred from acclaiming a party pledged to such developments by the fact that its far and ultimate ideals would seem to be made of the stuff of dreams.

Meantime the immediate future of Government belongs to the Liberal party. It is unlikely that, even if its leaders committed all the follies which some of their supporters appear to desire, they could hasten the formation of a Labour party strong enough within ten years or twenty to undertake the conduct of affairs. The alternative might appear to be such a fierce warfare between Liberalism and Labour as will allow Conservatism once again to triumph. But Conservatism since the election seems to have been sinking into an ever-deepening collapse. The Unionist party is not only divided about such lesser questions as Tariff Reform and the Macdonnell Letters; it has not yet made up its mind whether it is going forward as advocate or opponent of social progress. At the beginning of the session its leaders, especially Mr. Chamberlain, appeared to be making a deliberate overture towards a Conservative-Labour coalition. Some of the ablest of its

young members—more especially the brilliant editor of the *Outlook*—have been advocating the foundation of a Tory revival upon the lessons of Tory Democracy learnt by Lord Randolph Churchill from Mr. Disraeli. In the midst of a Liberalism given over, so they held, to middle-class notions, eager to disestablish the Church or to deprive the poor man of his beer, they would elevate a party which combines a high Imperialist doctrine with active and resolute advance in large policies of Social Reform. On the other hand, the more orthodox exponents of the dejected Tory centre seem to see a hope of revival in a general scare of property-holders against Liberal and Labour combined. Instead of dividing the two, they identify Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and his followers with the extreme utterances of the extreme left wing of the Socialist section. But all the parties are in the melting-pot, in this sudden revival of political vitality; in which, after a long period of sleep and silence, England has turned itself again to a resolute demand for change.

I have little doubt that with this problem is largely bound up the future of Tariff Reform. Tariff Reform can only be killed if the present Government can find itself able to make large advances in the work of social betterment. At present that dim under-world of human action in all the crowded cities which rarely becomes articulate has been stirred as never before within the memory of man. It is quite true to say that the vote of last January was not in any degree a vote for revolutionary change, and that the Liberals then obtained assistance from quite a number of middle-class supporters who had swung round to them, for the first time for many years, from the Conservative ranks. But their great and smashing successes were in the cities of Labour. At present, with their immense majority, they are committed to a gigantic 'straddle' to satisfy their extreme right while keeping their extreme left loyal. They will be compelled at last to choose between the offending some of their more Conservative supporters, or the disappointing of the desire for reform which they themselves have in part created amongst the labouring population. And the choice, when it comes, will decide their fate for a generation.

The desires of the forlorn classes have been immeasurably stimulated by the sight of the political destruction of Toryism and the enormous overturn of the last election. After such a cataclysm it is impossible that politics can return to the old easygoing ways. Finance is the centre of the situation. The demand is awake for a life more considerate, intelligent, and free than the life which belongs to-day to the working man. He believes he has a right to a larger share of the good things which life can give: which he thinks life alone can give, as the vision of a world beyond vanishes from his horizon and he abandons the hope of redress in the future for all the present injustice. He is being told to-day that the things which he desires require money, and that it is impossible for the money to be

obtained. Frankly, he does not believe it. He sees all around him evidences of an almost incredible accumulation—opulence, comfort, and luxury such as the world has never before known. Every day he can learn of legacies of hundreds of thousands left by the successful to their descendants. Every week a millionaire dies. Twenty or thirty of these legacies would provide old age pensions for all. Statistics are endorsed by his leaders showing what unequal percentage of the national income goes into the hands of the few; or, for example, how during all the time of the war, while he suffered from unemployment, the accumulation of the income-tax payer steadily advanced to its present astonishing dimensions. At the same time he is being assured by the politician that there is no means of getting at this wealth for the common good. He is told that any extravagant hope of an income from taxation of land is inevitably doomed to failure; that a graduated income-tax would be scarcely worth the trouble of collection; that the country is already staggering under a burden of taxation greater than it can bear.

Meantime the Tariff Reformers are exhibiting to him a source from which, however doubtful in its origin, no one can doubt millions would pass into the public exchequer. The Free-trader informs him that this will only be taking from one hand what he is gaining in the other. But at least, he is thinking, it will take from the rich as well as from the poor; so that on the whole the poor may be the gainer.

This is the alternative which will be offered to the continuance of a Liberal party content with changes merely political and a practical acquiescence in present conditions. From such an alternative a Social Reformist party may come as a deliverance. Much of its future will depend on the economic changes which may be before the nation, and which are outside the volition of any statesman or party. Much will depend on the ability, tenacity, and patience which may be revealed amongst the Labour leaders. Much depends on the policy which the Liberal party will pursue in the immediate days to come. Those who come first into politics with the determination to press for the realisation of great social reforms to which this new Labour party is committed, will contemplate with interest but with no anxiety the development of its growing power.

C. F. G. MASTERMAN.

A LIBERAL'S PLEA FOR COMPULSORY SERVICE

'The Free Conservative leader, Herr von Kirchhoff . . . dissented from Herr Richter's anticipation that universal service would be adopted in England. That country was ruled by the Stock Exchange, and so long as this was the case there could be no question of universal service.'—Debate on the German Navy Bill, March 29, 1906.

THOUGH Mr. Haldane, in all his recent speeches, has steadily dis-claimed any intention of compelling English citizens to qualify for the defence of their hearths and homes in case of necessity, he has made it easier for a Liberal to own himself as hearty an advocate of compulsory service as of compulsory taxation and compulsory education. Mr. Haldane, while nominally adhering to the doctrines of the Blue-Water School, recognises still, like a good business man, that the report of a Royal Commission on the impossibility of invasion will not necessarily secure us permanently and absolutely against unreasonable foreigners who may happen to know more of the theory and practice of war than of British Blue-books. He shows a laudable anxiety to make assurance doubly sure, if only in order to enable our fleet to do the real duty of a fleet in foreign waters, instead of hugging the home coasts to guard an otherwise miserably defended country. He sees very clearly that we need, behind the enlisted regulars which we must always have for foreign service, a reserve of partially-trained men beyond comparison more numerous and more efficient than any which we have had during the last three generations : and he suggests that this reserve might be enlisted by voluntary effort, organised by the county authorities, and trained strictly for local defence. 'We have got an object-lesson,' he adds, 'in the army of Switzerland': but the Swiss army 'has to be raised by conscription,' and for such an army as Mr. Haldane suggests 'anything like compulsion or conscription,' he fears, 'will defeat its own purpose.' Yet after dwelling on the obvious military advantages of a large reserve of partially-trained citizens available at any time for home defence, and affording a far more valuable recruiting-ground for the volunteer regular army than our present untrained population can afford, he points out that this is essentially as much a civic

as a military question : that hitherto (as he puts it), ' the army problem has been studied too much apart from its social and non-military aspects.' It may be worth while, therefore, to comment from this latter point of view on the suggested object-lesson of the Swiss army. Readers of this Review may be interested to see how the workings of the Swiss citizen-militia have struck an English civilian, who has done just enough of volunteering to concern him seriously with the question of national defence, but whose original interest in the Swiss army was rather social and historical. Twenty years ago, whilst touring as a student of mediæval history and antiquities, I found my way to Lauffenburg, on the Upper Rhine, and saw by chance a muster of the local militia. I could not help noticing their strong resemblance in many ways to our English volunteers, especially to the outward aspect of the earlier volunteers, whom I watched drilling as a child from 1865 onwards, when the ranks were crowded with bearded and whiskered fathers of families—lawyers, doctors, tradesmen and their employés—a little round-shouldered and stiff in their movements, no doubt, but carrying even into their volunteering something of the earnest of their daily bread work. What struck me next, however, was the obvious superiority of this Swiss military training over that of any British volunteers. In the essentials of discipline and military efficiency, these men compared with ours almost as a week-day class compares with a class at a Sunday school.¹ Nor did it even appear to the spectator that they lacked the bright crown of voluntary service. For in Switzerland, at any rate, the compulsory training in the elements of military science does not ' defeat its own purpose ' by damping volunteer energies. On the contrary, just as our own compulsion in elementary education has enormously increased voluntary reading in Great Britain—as the days of compulsory practice with the longbow were also the days when Englishmen were proudest to perfect themselves voluntarily in that difficult weapon—so these ' conscripted ' Swiss do more volunteer training, *over and above their compulsory minimum*, than all the voluntary training of modern England put together. The Swiss officer is practically a volunteer for a far harder and longer military service than that of his fellow-citizens, yet the Swiss officers form a larger proportion of the whole population than all our English volunteers put together—rank and file and officers. Again, the volunteer rifle-practice of Switzerland is still more disproportionate to that of England, even during these last few years. It is indeed strange that we English can so delude ourselves as to the attitude of all Continental nations towards compulsory service. Even in France and Germany, where the military burden is just four times as heavy as in Switzerland, and where the

¹ To give a single example : our own Volunteer Artillery, even in large towns, was armed with muzzle-loading cannon until four or five years ago ; the Swiss got rid of their muzzle-loaders directly after the Franco-German war, thirty years earlier !

subjection of the citizen-private to a professional caste of officers gives occasion for only too many abuses—even in France and Germany we may assure ourselves by one simple test that the nation as a whole approves of its compulsory system: for even the less democratic of those two countries has practically manhood suffrage, yet no political party ever attempts to repeal the Service Laws. Even Socialist critics, like Bebel in Germany, and Favon at Geneva, admit the principle of compulsion, and would only shorten or modify the service.

But what interested me in those days was not so much the practical comparison of this force with our own volunteers, not so much even its social and political working, as its history. For, on enquiry, I found that this was simply the old mediæval militia, kept up from century to century as a working machine. The modern Swiss rifleman is, therefore, in historical filiation, the brother of those British bowmen who, at Neville's Cross, gained one of the most glorious victories in our annals, at a moment when the regular army was abroad for the campaign of Crécy. Moreover, just as that century and a half from Crécy to Agincourt saw also a rapid increase in English civic and political liberties, with a corresponding decrease in the liberties of non-conscripted France,² so also the Swiss, in spite of their compulsory system of home defence, are the freest nation, and perhaps the most prosperous, in Continental Europe. It is difficult to explain away these two facts. History lends no countenance to the popular British belief that compulsory service, any more than compulsory education, is prejudicial to real freedom. That there is much in the modern German army inconsistent with the claims of modern democracy nobody would deny, and least of all perhaps those who most stoutly uphold the existing conditions. But these illiberal tendencies are mere local accidents, easily separable from the essential principle of universal service. The Swiss system, so far from being anti-democratic, is at least as popular in its essence and in its working as any institution of modern England. I must pause here to explain this difference between the Swiss and other 'conscripted' armies, for it is radical—so radical, in fact, that the Socialist party in France and in Germany contends nowadays, not for the abolition of compulsory service, but simply for its remodelling on the Swiss system.

The difference is briefly this: Switzerland is the only country whose officers, as well as her privates, are citizens first and soldiers afterwards. In France and Germany the ordinary citizen serves simply as a private. The whole commanding force of the army is vested in a professional military caste, whose interests have more

² The obligation of manhood service, though nominally in force nearly everywhere in the Middle Ages, was in fact commonly commuted in mediæval France, as in modern England, for a war-tax. See S. Luce, *Du Guesclin*, p. 132. For our growth in liberties during this period see Green, *English Town Life*, vol. i. pp. 20-29.

than once clashed violently with those of the nation at large. During a cosmopolitan social gathering at Heidelberg, in the days when England was still popular in Germany for her recent help and sympathy during the Franco-Prussian war, a young Englishman gave the toast of 'The German Army,' as a compliment to the many officers present. He innocently expressed the very natural hope that Germany, having reaped her full harvest of laurels and secured her high European position, might enjoy a long period of peace and prosperity. His words roused a good-natured uproar, and shouts of 'No! War! War!' came from every part of the hall. The civilians shrugged their shoulders with a faint smile, but the officers' cry was spontaneous and natural. This is the kind of incident which goes far to explain such a book as M. Urbain Gohier's *L'Armée contre la Nation*. But such an incident would have been even more impossible in Switzerland than in our own country. Apart from a permanent professional staff of about 300 men, every Swiss officer earns his living by some ordinary civic employment. He receives military pay only for the few weeks which he actually spends on service, and that pay scarcely ever amounts to anything like an adequate commercial compensation for his loss of time. He must begin by serving in the ranks, and earn his promotion by merit alone. The system is decentralised as much as possible; many of the details are left to the local authorities. In short, the Swiss army is only one aspect of the Swiss nation, and it would be difficult to name any English institution which commands more loyal allegiance than this from all parties in the State. Let me try to bring this home to the reader by quoting the evidence which I collected six years ago, in order to corroborate or correct the impression I had already formed by frequent enquiries from fellow-travellers and similar chance acquaintances.³ In that year, 1900, in which it was first realised by Englishmen at large that some reform in our army system was necessary, I took a journey to Switzerland for the purpose of collecting evidence on the army, more especially from the civilian's point of view. Armed with one or two valuable introductions, I was able to procure a series of thoroughly representative interviews. The gentlemen who thus kindly gave me information were a member of the National Council (who is also the leader of the National Radical party, and whom we in England should call almost a Socialist), the official Labour Secretary,⁴ four colonels,⁵ a major-instructor, four

³ The evidence here given, with much more bearing on the constitution and working of the Swiss militia, may be read in a pamphlet of fifty pages entitled *A Strong Army in a Free State* (Sumpkin, Marshall & Co., 1s. net).

⁴ The Labour Secretary is an intermediary between the working classes and the Government. The latter supplies him with a salary, an office, and a staff; but he is elected entirely by the votes of his fellow-labourers, and his functions are purely economical and non-political.

⁵ Except that one general is elected in time of war, there is no higher rank than colonel in the Swiss army.

clergymen (two of whom were university professors and three chaplains in the army), two other university professors, the editors of a Conservative and of a Social-Democratic newspaper, two bankers, two other gentlemen engaged in commerce, and the head-master of a private school. Five of these twenty gentlemen were also captains or lieutenants in different branches of the army. They represented, as the list itself will suggest, the most varied shades of political opinion; and most of them were kind enough to revise the proofs of the following lines, in which I summarise my enquiries and their answers:

I. It is sometimes feared in England that even the most modified form of compulsory service might contain dangerous germs of militarism. Does the experience of Switzerland give the least countenance to these fears?

None whatever. The misgivings expressed in our two Chambers by those who opposed the new Constitution of 1874 were roused not by the principle of compulsion, which the nation has always accepted, but by a cantonal distrust of the proposed *centralisation*. It is probable that such fears, even then, were rather assumed for party purposes: but in any case the twenty-six years' experience of a more strongly organised army has given them the direct lie.

II. Can it be said that there is even the nucleus of a party which would dare to make the abolition of compulsory service one of its watchwords?

A practically unanimous No, as emphatic from Social Democrats as from Conservatives. At Zürich, perhaps the most Radical town in Switzerland, I heard no qualification of this denial; only in the most populous parts of French Switzerland I heard of a certain opposition on extreme Socialist lines, starting from the thesis that all war is immoral, and working mainly by an appeal for a reduction of national expenses. The Radical leader wrote to me, 'We are all supporters of the principle of compulsory service, but we do not all agree on the details of its application.' Shortly afterwards, in a debate on the Military Budget, the Socialist leader who moved a reduction of expenses expressly disclaimed any attack on the principle of compulsory service.

III. Is there the least cause to fear an increase of Jingoism or Chauvinism as the result of training a whole nation in the use of arms?

On the contrary, experience teaches us that a citizen army, officered by citizens, is the best safeguard against Jingoism.

IV. Does the Swiss system seriously trammel trade and industry?

The burden which it throws upon the nation is cheerfully borne for the sake of the results obtained. The Labour party thoroughly accepts the principle of compulsion, while employers say that, on the whole, it makes their men more intelligent workers; and all point to the plain fact that Switzerland is quite in the front rank of the world's commerce and industry. There are, of course, hard cases sometimes, but these are quite exceptional, and the Labour Secretary assured me emphatically that it was in no sense a national grievance.

V. What is the physical effect of the service on the people?

So excellent that, if for any conceivable reason the military system should be abolished, it would be necessary to invent something to take its place as an instrument of national physical education.

VI. What is the moral effect of this short course of barrack and camp life?

* It is instructive to find the German Socialist Bebel (*Nicht Stehendes Heer*, p. 60) claiming that the Swiss system 'would make *coups d'état* impossible' if introduced into Germany. In English history the 'conscripted' militia was looked upon as a national protection against the disorderly tendencies of feudal or mercenary forces.

† So also argues the Socialist Bebel, p. 60.

On the whole, excellent also. The great majority of parents have no anxieties about barrack life, beyond those inseparable from the age of the recruits (twenty) and their first entrance into the world; while the discipline is universally recognised as an important factor in the formation of character. The Swiss are agreed, without distinction of party, that the healthy *camaraderie* engendered by the service is a most valuable factor in the national education. Nearly all my informants were parents whose sons were or had been in the army; and such regrets as I heard were from those who had had a son rejected. Several said outright that, quite apart from military reasons, they would gladly send their sons to the barracks, simply as a healthy introduction to the school of life.

VII. Is there any fear lest this discipline should weaken the individual's independence of character, and tend to reduce him to a machine?

On the contrary, with its practical experience of life, it tends rather to make him more resourceful and more self-reliant. Quite incidentally, and in reply to another question, one gentleman drew between the mechanical obedience of a German clerk and the more independent ways of a native clerk very much the same distinction which would be drawn by the English business man. It is difficult to speak too strongly of the liberal-minded common sense with which the Swiss army laws are worked.

VIII. Has it any tendency to weary the citizen, and to disgust him with things military?

Its general tendency is very strongly the other way. There are few national institutions which, on the whole, command more enthusiasm and affection than the army.

I need add no direct comment on these answers, representing as they do the unanimous accord of twenty citizens who had scarcely anything in common except wide experience, high literary or business qualities, and love of their country. But I should like to urge one or two considerations to confirm the idea left by this Swiss experience, that, of all English political parties, the Liberals have least reason to fear compulsory manhood service. Nothing could be more destructive of true Liberalism than that the whole political power of our nation should be vested in a population scantily educated, even in the narrowest sense of the word, eager at every point to claim civic privileges, and unfamiliar with the idea of civic responsibilities. Yet, at present, the ordinary British voter pays no direct taxes, and has no direct reminder of his civic duties after he has completed his brief school course—in which, by-the-by, he alone of all civilised schoolboys is never systematically taught what the Fatherland has done for him, and what are his reciprocal duties towards his country. As Liberals, we are living on our capital—on the impetus of organised patriotic efforts called out by past times of peril, but well nigh forgotten now after a century of almost unexampled peace and worldly ease. We are no longer the one free parliamentary nation, in contrast to the mediæval absolutism of other great Powers. On the contrary, we are rapidly distancing all other European countries in the development of those characteristics which ripened ancient Rome for despotism—cheap corn, a growing claim for State sustenance of the individual worker, with a parallel tendency to forget the old citizen-responsibility

for home defence, and to trust hired soldiers, native or foreign, with our whole military fortunes. This is why the Swiss system is such an important object-lesson to everyone who feels the responsibilities as well as the privileges of democracy.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the social value of this Swiss system which compels all classes to serve together in the ranks, and insists on promotion by merit only. Even here, of course, quite apart from heredity, the better educated and better fed classes have a definite advantage; but very many working men do in fact fight their way to the front. The promotion of such men, besides being a standing testimonial to their manliness, is almost always directly profitable to them in their civil occupations also; in the case of more than one citizen, his brief military service has laid the foundation of his future success. There can be no better lesson for a rich and idle boy than to see the son of a labouring man set over him in real earnest. On the other hand, the fact that the sons of the upper classes do on an average show a decided superiority even under these fresh conditions, goes far to reconcile the working man to social inequalities which he sees so clearly to be the product of other forces than mere chance. Next to the abomination of tyranny, there can scarcely be a more fatal spirit than that other extreme, when the long-oppressed working man suddenly convinces himself that he possesses all the natural qualities of the rich man, if only he can manage to strip the latter of his purely accidental possessions.

Moreover, this army problem is very intimately connected with the educational question. While we boast in England that a tiny fraction of our citizens enjoy the best schooling in the world, we have hitherto allowed the enormous majority to muddle on, not only under far inferior class-teaching to that of their foreign compeers, but with far less provision for their training in physique or character. That is, we have persistently neglected, in spite of the example of other great States, to equip ninety-nine hundredths of our citizens with that very training on which we pride ourselves perhaps unduly for the remaining hundredth. It is only during the last year or two that we have even begun to remedy this neglect; and now nothing would do so much to help this reform as a business-like and thoroughly democratic organisation for home defence. Nobody who studies the Swiss system can fail to see that it affords to the masses a great deal of that training in physique and character which our English public schools afford to the classes only. The relation between officers and men is very much of that elder-brother type which obtains between public school masters and boys, and there is much the same open career for personal distinction, independently of birth and rank. At the present moment, there is in many ways less personal intercourse between our rich and poor than at any period of our past history; and there could be no healthier way of bringing them together than this compulsion to bear

an obvious national duty side by side during three or four months of their early manhood.

Indeed, apart from a sort of fatalistic conviction that this duty which comes so easily to foreigners is impossible to us, the stock arguments against universal service in England seem to rest almost entirely on insular prejudice and ignorance. It is branded as un-English; yet it was in fact one of the mainstays of the English Constitution during the two decisive centuries in which English Parliamentary institutions were formed and fixed, and the English character took its peculiar national form. Even Trafalgar and Waterloo, as has been pointed out again and again, were won to a great extent by 'conscripted' men. Again, universal service is popularly supposed to be a badge of tyranny, while in fact it rests on the most democratic principles; it is clung to with pride by the most democratic country in Europe; and, even in Russia, Germany or Austria, it marks a stage of civilisation far more democratic than that of 100 years ago, when those countries relied almost entirely on hired professional soldiers. We boast that the idea of manhood-service for home defence is incompatible with British freedom, whereas our foreign critics, even the most friendly, can seldom see any real obstacle but British conservatism and indolence. Those of us who have friends in France or Germany know that most foreigners share more or less strongly the view of the German statesman which I have taken for my motto. They cannot see with our eyes, or find a token of our exceeding magnanimity in the fact that not one in ten of our able-bodied citizens goes through even the hollowest form of qualifying to defend his own home. On the contrary, it seems to them a proof of our selfishness and our subjection to the Stock Exchange.

At the same time, there is no denying the existence of a widespread prejudice amongst us; and it is difficult to over-estimate the *vis inertiae* of British Conservatism, even among those who would be least willing to claim that party name. But the essence of true Liberalism is an open mind: and I venture to plead earnestly with my fellow Liberals for a serious consideration of this vital question. After all, our present compulsory school system was once violently combated on the ground that it would be destructive of British freedom. In this connexion, the growing number of thoughtful men who welcome the idea of universal service, even more for its social than for its military consequences, may take heart from the following words of no less uncompromising a Liberal than John Richard Green (*Letters*, p. 171):

The present system of education has done much—yes, but it has done all that it can do. No mere quarrels about conscience-clauses can touch *that* matter. Nothing *can* touch it but a general system of compulsory national education, supported by a national rate. I wish people could see the *waste* of the present system, half a dozen schools, British, National, Private, where one

good large school would suffice at *one-third* of the total expense, at double the present results. But what chance is there of such a change? Just none whatever.

Three years after these despairing words were written, the principle of compulsory education was accepted; and we have spent the last thirty years lamenting that we did not accept it two generations earlier.

G. G. COULTON.

P.S.—It may be well to point out how far this question has developed even during the past few weeks.

(1) Mr. Haldane, while still shrinking from the logical conclusion of his words, speaks again very strongly of the '*obligation of National Defence*'; assures us 'unless your Army is based on the people it will be, according to modern war standards, a weak army'; and contends emphatically that universal service, instead of spelling 'militarism,' has 'a steady and sobering influence on the nation.' (Speeches of the 14th and 28th of September.)

(2) The *Spectator*, after fighting steadily during many years for a volunteer solution of the Army question, has at last been frankly converted to some sort of universal service by the splendid success of Colonel Pollock's experimental six months' course with a raw militia company. (Leading article of the 15th of September.)

(3) Mr. Keir Hardie's recent denunciation of compulsory service in the name of 'the democracies abroad,' has elicited an exposure of this stale fallacy from several correspondents in the *Times* (notably the 24th, 25th, and 26th of September). Dr. Shadwell points out that the system which Mr. Keir Hardie denounces is on the contrary warmly advocated by the German Social Democrats; he is emphatically corroborated next day by the London correspondent of the official Social-Democratic *Vorwärts*; and Mr. G. F. Snee follows with similar quotations from Mr. H. Quelch's pamphlet, *Social Democracy and the Armed Nation*, published by the English Social Democratic Federation. Mr. Keir Hardie has (I believe) made no attempt to defend his misstatement: and this *felix error* has already done much to warn thinking men against the hidebound Conservatism which too often passes for Liberalism, as Radicalism may also masquerade under so-called Conservative proposals.

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE NAVY

THE public mind has been unsettled and some anxiety has been occasioned by recent naval events. Following upon the loss of the battleship *Montagu* off Lundy Island, came the Government's decision to cut down the programme of shipbuilding, and recently rumours have been current as to an intention to reduce the striking power of the fleet by withdrawing ships from commission and to cast on the scrap-heap a number of battleships.

It is an unfortunate result of the party system of government that even questions of defence are not always considered dispassionately on their merits. The sufficiency and efficiency of the British fleet is a matter outside the sphere of political strife. It should be the creed of the nation that the fleet must in no circumstances be sacrificed to the exigencies of party. This is a two-edged sword. It cuts resolutely on the one hand at those in power who would starve the fleet in order to serve the interests of their party and render a popular Budget possible, and on the other it disarms those in opposition who would 'engineer' or encourage a naval panic by a misrepresentation or suppression of essential factors in the situation, in order to gain popularity in the constituencies. The admission that the Navy is above party should silence politicians who would rouse party feeling against a naval administration, because for the time being the Board of Admiralty is associated with a Government whose general policy does not arouse their sympathy. The Board of Admiralty is a collective body partly civil and partly naval, and it knows no politics; the present Board, with a Liberal Cabinet in office, is appointing Lord Charles Beresford, a Tory and a former Tory M.P., to the most coveted appointment in its gift—the command of the Channel fleet. The expert character of the Board does not vary when a change of Government occurs. It thus happens that the naval advisers of the present Government are the same as those who served the late Cabinet, with so much advantage to the Empire. In the face of this continuity in the *personnel* of the Board of Admiralty the nation may reasonably expect continuity of policy, on which the efficiency of a warlike weapon, the product of gradual, patient development, must depend.

In a country which is ruled on the party system it is admittedly difficult for those who are in opposition to view the administration of any department of the State without bias. Events have shown that it is not impossible. Successive Unionist Governments under the premiership of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Arthur Balfour were practically responsible for the creation of the fleet as it exists to-day; now the fortune of the polls has placed them in Opposition. During the ten years when under Unionist control the Navy Estimates leapt up from year to year owing to unavoidable causes, the Government received loyal support from Mr. Haldane, Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, Mr. John Burns, all now Cabinet Ministers, and from Lord Rosebery, Sir Charles Dilke and others of the most enlightened members of the Liberal party. Now that those who were in Opposition have returned to power, the least that the Unionist party can do is to accord to them the same measure of support—in fact imitate the generosity of their opponents. The Government is on its trial, let the trial be fair.

The public, who are necessarily ignorant, to a great extent, of the history of naval policy and the intricacies of naval armaments, may well seek for some guiding rule, free from the bias of party, by which they may judge whether the provision for the fleet which is made from time to time is adequate for the necessities of the Empire. The standard by which naval policy should be judged may be summarised briefly:—

(1) *The Two-Power standard must be maintained*; in other words, the strength of the British fleet must be as great as that of the next two most considerable fleets in Europe, with a margin over for contingencies. From year to year an adequate number of ships must be built so as to ensure that the strength of the fleet shall not fall below the standard of absolute safety as old ships become obsolete. But this does not necessarily mean that in each financial year the Admiralty shall lay down as many ships as for instance Germany and France, because the work of construction in this country is carried on far more swiftly than in France and a good deal more swiftly than in Germany, and consequently the ships which are begun for the British Navy are completed and at sea at an earlier date. We have fewer ships in an unfinished state, consequently, and the British people have the satisfaction of knowing that they have less capital lying idle in the ship yards, while at the same time the men-of-war on which their defence depends are always of more modern types than those under foreign flags.

(2) *The war efficiency of the fleet must not be sacrificed*.—We may have a huge fleet, but unless it is manned by experienced and trained officers and by well-drilled crews of high morale it will prove a deception and a snare in the day of crisis. In the late war Russia had ships in plenty, but she had not a fighting fleet. A war edge can

be put to a Navy only by frequent practice at sea—this means a heavy bill for the payment of the officers and men, and for the provision of coal, ammunition, and stores.

If measured by this standard can the public still repose its confidence in the Admiralty and in the Cabinet which controls the National purse?

The present Government in July last announced that it had decided not to begin one of the battleships, three of the ocean-going destroyers, and four of the submarines included in the shipbuilding programme for the current financial year. This will result in a saving of two and a half millions spread over three years. The original proposals were submitted to the House of Commons in March last with the proviso that towards the end of the autumn they would be revised with a view to reductions if events justified such a course. This reduction has been represented in some quarters as a betrayal of the highest national interests, and the naval advisers on the Board of Admiralty have been roundly denounced for their weakness in giving way to those politicians who in the cause of economy are willing to risk even the essential supremacy of the British fleet. The naval officers on the Board have been told that they have thereby lost the confidence of the country and of the naval service.

From the comments on the revised naval programme it might be supposed that the Sea Lords had committed an act without parallel. As a matter of fact this change in the shipbuilding programme does not stand alone, but when the Board of Admiralty varied its programme before it happened that a Government of a different complexion was in power, and it forgot—or at least omitted—to inform Parliament that it had been found unnecessary to construct some of the ships specified when the year's estimates were submitted. For party purposes, in order to placate the 'economy-at-any-price' wing of the Liberal party—who are a serious menace to the maintenance of the fleet—and to show them the earnestness of the Cabinet's desire for retrenchment, the Government of to-day took the House of Commons into its confidence and thereby has brought on itself, and on the Sea Lords in particular, the reproaches of a section of the Press.

On what previous occasion, it may be asked, did the Board of Admiralty reduce the shipbuilding programme deliberately presented to Parliament in the spring? In order to make the incidents clear, it must be explained that the significance in a shipbuilding programme of an armoured cruiser and a battleship is not dissimilar. Both, even in these days of colossal battleships, cost the same. The difference in fighting value between the two types is so inconsiderable as to be hardly recognisable. In the battleship a certain measure of speed is sacrificed to obtain great gun power and a high standard of armour protection. In the armoured cruiser the armour and armament are some-

what lighter, and the weight thus saved is devoted to more powerful engines. A *King Edward VII.*, a recent battleship, represents an outlay of 1,473,243*l.*, and a *Shannon*, a contemporary armoured cruiser, costs 1,424,216*l.* Again, a *Dreadnought*, the latest and biggest type of battleship, cannot be built even in England for less than 1,797,477*l.*, and an *Invincible*, the most recently designed and colossal armoured cruiser, runs into 1,736,645*l.* These figures are official, as set down in the Navy Estimates, and include guns. It will be seen that in the eyes of the economist it matters not whether the Admiralty abandon the building of a *Shannon* or a *King Edward VII.* of 1904 or 1905, or a *Dreadnought* or an *Invincible* of 1906, since in the case of each type the saving of expense is virtually the same. Now it happens that in the autumn of 1904, under the late Government, a *Shannon*, a most powerful armoured cruiser, was dropped out of the programme which Parliament had approved in the early summer, and not only was the intention to construct this vessel abandoned, but no fewer than fourteen torpedo-boat destroyers were also not ordered. The Cabinet regarded the matter so lightly that Parliament was not informed at the time, and no clamour was raised even when the secret was revealed. Again last year the late Government, after announcing in the spring on the authority of the Admiralty one programme as desirable, determined in the autumn not to build one of the armoured cruisers of the *Invincible* type. Once more nothing was said at the time to Parliament; the fact leaked out unofficially and then was confessed publicly without shame. By this decision in the two financial years ending the 31st of March, 1906, the late Government effected an economy of upwards of three and a half millions sterling, and no reproach was hurled at it, and the Sea Lords were not held up to reprobation. Now that the present Government has made reductions in this year's programme representing two and a half millions only spread over three years—or 4½ millions including the reduction in next year's programme already announced—his Majesty's Ministers are held to have betrayed their trust, and the Sea Lords are no longer worthy of the confidence of the country, because they have made 'an abject surrender.' The confusion of ideas arises solely from the bias of party feeling which leads many Radicals to charge the Tories with supporting 'bloated armaments' and Tories to suggest that the Liberals are guilty of conniving at 'the undoing of the Empire.'

The changes of naval policy in these three years are capable of justification, but because the facts are concerned with foreign Powers it has been considered lacking in tact and injurious to our relations abroad for representatives of the Government to elaborate officially the position in the House of Commons. In 1904 and 1905 the elimination of two armoured cruisers and fourteen destroyers, representing a saving of three and a half millions, was caused neither by Treasury pressure nor by any desire on the part of Mr. Balfour

and his colleagues to effect an unwise economy. The change was due solely to two events: first, the Russian disasters off Port Arthur, and secondly the *débâcle* of Admiral Rojdesventsky's fleet in the Straits of Tsushima—in short the practical annihilation of the Russian fleet. In calculating the requisite strength of the British fleet, the Admiralty had, for years past, compared it with the fleets of France and Russia, two Powers in close alliance and both at the time in violent antagonism to this country. On the basis of these calculations the British building programmes for the previous decade and a half had been consistently framed. It was reasonable, therefore, that in 1904 and 1905, as the Russian fleet was swept off the seas, the Admiralty should revise their requirements.

^ Last autumn, when the estimates were considered, a new basis had to be sought for 1906-7. With the disappearance of the Russian fleet, the next two most formidable navies remaining were those of France and Germany.¹ There was well-authenticated information as to the rapid steps both nations intended to take to build new ships of types much more powerful than had been contemplated before. At the same time the Russian Admiralty allowed it to be known that the task of rebuilding the Russian navy would be taken in hand at once, and pushed on with all haste, the assistance of foreign firms being freely sought, as had been the case when the Port Arthur fleet was created with the aid of German, French, and American designers, gun makers, armour manufacturers, and shipbuilders. As the months passed it became evident that none of these anticipations would be immediately realised. Owing to the sensational features attributed to the British *Dreadnought*, foreign designers of ships determined to proceed warily, and at length decided to wait until the *Dreadnought* had undergone her trials before embarking on what after all will be as nearly faithful copies as can be contrived of a vessel which marks an entirely new departure in naval construction. The year is drawing to a close, and French and German and Russian constructors are still anxiously waiting, though the *Dreadnought* has been completed. The important factor in the situation is that *not a single battleship has been laid down in Europe since October last*. This is a notable fact.

Owing to these circumstances, the Admiralty determined that they could postpone some of the new construction. It is bad policy on

¹ In the House of Commons, on July 27, the Prime Minister said: 'I do not object to a Two-Power standard as a rough guide,' but a standard based on French and German shipbuilding 'is a Two-Power standard of almost a preposterous kind.' Nevertheless it is apparently the standard of the Admiralty, and so long as this is the case, the pious personal opinion of the Prime Minister, spoken evidently without serious consideration, does not seriously matter. When this essential 'rough guide, based on the French and German fleets, is definitely abandoned, then it will be time for the nation to act decisively. Presumably the Cabinet and the Admiralty would have to endorse such a dangerous change of policy.

national grounds to spend money in creating a navy of unnecessary strength. In the first place the standard of taxation in the United Kingdom is still on a war scale, and national credit is lower than it has been for many years. While it is true that adequate armaments are essential to national credit, any expenditure above the margin of safety is waste. High national credit is as much an instrument of war as battleships, cruisers, and torpedo craft, because an impoverished country cannot stand the strain of hostilities. In time of peace every opportunity consistent with safety must be seized for cutting down unnecessary expenditure, and lifting the weight of taxation off the nation. Otherwise when war occurs there will be no financial margin to enable the country to bear the enormous cost of war, as money for warlike operations will have to be raised on terms of a character so arbitrary as to take the heart out of the nation at the very moment when it needs all its courage, resolution, and determination. In the second place men-of-war rapidly become obsolete, like industrial machinery. Science in its application to armaments is continually perfecting the means of offence and defence, and as improvements are effected so existing weapons pass to the scrap-heap. This process is always in progress, and never more so than to-day. It is mistaken policy, therefore, to lay out more capital than is essential to absolute safety in any one year, because it follows that the more money is spent on ships of the 1906 period, the less money the nation will have, or at least will be inclined, to spend on the more perfectly developed fighting machines of 1909 or 1910. Extravagance on naval armaments is not only not synonymous with efficiency and strength, but has a distinct tendency to inefficiency, is economically unsound, and tends to destroy the national credit and thus rob the country of its reserve of financial strength which is essential for the prosecution of a successful and it may be long campaign. An England exhausted financially within a short time of the breaking out of war will be an England defeated.

On three occasions in the past ten years supplementary ship-building proposals were introduced in answer to the projects of one rival Power—Russia, and in three years, owing mainly to the disappearance of the Russian Navy, the Admiralty's demands were reduced. Those who view the continued invincibility of the British fleet as the prime factor in the welfare of the Empire should welcome this elasticity in the shipbuilding vote. The Admiralty frame their estimates in the autumn of one year on the probabilities of the next twelve months, and these proposals are submitted to the House of Commons in the spring. The Admiralty proceeds with its preparation of designs, &c., on the basis of this programme, but at the same time an observant eye is kept by our attachés on the projects of foreign Powers and on the progress they are making with their ships. Week by week the Admiralty knows exactly what is occurring

abroad, and it has become the practice to postpone the discussion of the shipbuilding vote in the House of Commons until late in the Session. If by this time nothing has happened to upset the Board's anticipations, framed nearly twelve months before, no change is recommended. If, on the other hand, rivals have taken steps which are held to threaten our supremacy, supplementary shipbuilding proposals are introduced; and similarly if foreign Powers have not made the progress anticipated, or events favourable to Britain's supreme naval position have occurred, the Admiralty is morally bound to revise and reduce their programme. If the wisdom of the former course of action is admitted, it is impossible to deny the wisdom of the latter.

Naval enthusiasts are apt to demand 'more ships, more ships,' on every possible excuse, and thereby the Admiralty, did it listen to these complaints, would run the risk of wearying the nation. It is the height of unwisdom for those who have to make preparations for war to be continually crying 'Wolf, wolf,' because the cry wearies on the ear, and when a crisis comes the nation will not respond. But if the authorities when an emergency arises can point to their moderation in the past—for instance in 1905 and 1906 the Navy Estimates were reduced by five millions sterling—their cry of alarm breaking on the country as it did in 1897 and 1898 will have an immediate result. The Board of Admiralty must practise the wisdom of moderation if it would retain the support of the nation, which reposes in it a great trust. The average man does not profess to understand the intricacies of naval policy, and the Admiralty has won the confidence of the whole body of Englishmen by the very fact that it has placed itself between the nation, as a community subject to economic laws, and the intemperate advocates of sea-power, who have no responsibility and who always ask for more ships, as though ships were sea-power.

The revised programme which the Government has submitted to Parliament can be regarded without dismay as a temporary measure; there is no excuse for an outcry. The strongest pressure was put upon the Government to lay down no armoured ships at all this year; it was pleaded with many specious and misleading arguments that the British Navy was so strong that it could safely desist from beginning any new warships for a year or more, and thus give a veritable lead in disarmament. Roseate pictures of the strength of the fleet were painted, and the Cabinet was urged to take its courage in both hands and insist that there should be a lull in new construction for the Navy. The Cabinet did not succumb.

The real point is the adequacy or inadequacy of the revised programme which provides for laying down at once three battleships of an improved *Dreadnought* type instead of four, two ocean-going destroyers in place of five, and eight submarines instead of twelve, as originally intended, besides twelve small coastal destroyers, practically

torpedo-boats. The elimination of the torpedo craft will be very widely regretted, because for years past we have not built as many as the situation would seem to demand. We have been slowly relinquishing the lead we once possessed, and considering the extent of our coast line the present flotillas, which include a large number of obsolete and obsolescent ships, are altogether inadequate. Still, as a temporary expedient—particularly as we are developing entirely new types, and it is unwise to commit ourselves too deeply, this matter is not one of urgent importance, though the Navy will begrudge the loss of the three ocean-going destroyers in which it stands badly in need. After all the reduction has received the cachet of the expert advisers of the Government, and even the reduced programme comprises as many as twenty-two torpedo craft—besides a swift ‘mother ship’ for destroyers, actually an addition to the original programme—which is no mean number to figure in a single year’s commitment, following as it does upon no fewer than twenty-nine torpedo vessels last year.

Public anxiety centres in the sufficiency of the three *Dreadnoughts* for the needs of the fleet in the present financial year. In order to get away from all possibility of party bias, the best available evidence as to relative strength of British and foreign fleets is furnished by the latest issue of the *Taschenbuch der Kriegsflootten*, in which the armoured ships possessed by the three great naval Powers of Europe are compared, after eliminating all battleships over twenty-five years old and all armoured cruisers of over twenty years, which are the standards adopted in the German Navy Act. The figures show that in all classes of armoured ships, in expenditure on new construction, and in *personnel* we are up to the Two-Power standard, with a margin over. Great Britain needs a fleet invincible against any probable combination, and she possesses it to-day. British ships are larger and more powerful than foreign vessels, and this fact accounts for the variation between the aggregate displacement of battleships and the aggregate number credited to each country. In congratulating ourselves on the strength of the fleet, it must not be forgotten that a world-wide Empire and a world-wide trade have created strategical conditions in the case of Great Britain which affect no other nation to anything like the same extent. British naval power is, and must be, widely distributed.

As to the immediate future the important fact to be borne in mind is that we build quicker than any other nation, though not much more rapidly than Germany; this latter point is important, because we are apt to overestimate our superior shipbuilding facilities. We are going to complete the largest armoured ships, such as *Dreadnoughts*, in about two years, whereas Germany will take three

* These three vessels are to be commenced at once—one at Portsmouth Dockyard and one at Devonport Dockyard, a great deal of material having been already accumulated; and the third in a private yard.

years, and France from five to six. The result of our superiority in rate of building, which is considerable, after all allowances have been made, is that the British programme of 'ships building' always appears less considerable than that of rival countries, for the simple reason that the vessels are rapidly finished, ready for sea, and pass automatically from the list of 'ships building' to that of 'ships completed.' As an illustration, the six French battleships of the *Patrie* class, of which a good deal has been heard, were authorised as long ago as 1900; for six years they have figured as 'building.' Similarly this year the French have decided to lay down six more battleships, and they also will appear as 'building' until 1912. Consequently the new French programme of six battleships is equivalent really to only one a year. Germany, on the other hand, will lay down two battleships annually³ until 1910, and each will occupy three years to build.

These German battleships, like those authorised in France, will be as large even as the *Dreadnought*, and mark a new era in naval construction for which not the British Admiralty, but the war between Japan and Russia, is responsible. This contest showed that victory was decided not by a storm of 100-lb. shells from quick-firing guns, but by the great shells from 9·2 inch, 10-inch, and 12-inch weapons, shells deliberately aimed at the enemy, not at a range of 6,000 or 7,000 yards—that of the 6-inch gun—but at a range of 9,000 or 10,000 yards. Owing to this discovery the Japanese promptly set to work building huge ships carrying only the heaviest guns and mounting none of the secondary guns, such as the 6-inch and 7·5-inch weapons, which hitherto had been thought likely to decide the issue of battle. The typical warship of to-day carries only four 12-inch or 11-inch guns and from twelve to fourteen 6-inch weapons. Experience of war showed the Japanese that the smaller weapons were ineffective, and they decided to construct ships to carry only the heaviest guns, to give knock-out blows at an extreme range at which the secondary armament of an enemy's typical battleship could do no damage. Thus it happens that the Japanese are building two huge battleships of 19,000 tons, each with no fewer than four 12-inch and twelve 10-inch guns besides a dozen 4·7-inch weapons for repelling attacks by torpedo craft, and we, as the allies of Japan and the sharers of her secrets, have just completed the *Dreadnought* of 17,900 tons, mounting ten 12-inch guns and twenty-seven weapons for using against torpedo-boats; and we have in hand—begun last spring—three ships of the *Invincible* class, styled 'armoured cruisers,' but really swift *Dreadnoughts*—of almost the same size, with the same broadside fire of eight 12-inch guns, but lighter armour, in exchange for higher speed—25 knots instead of 21 knots. The *Dreadnought* is the ship of the future, and unfortunately it will render most existing battleships obsolete. Owing to increased range and high speed, three knots more than existing battleships,

³ Germany has laid down no battleship for over a year.

a *Dreadnought* cannot fight to advantage with ships built prior to the war and intended to depend mainly upon the comparatively feeble short-range gun of medium size. As Great Britain and Japan are being copied by other Powers, neither country can hesitate to go on building these colossal ships of war of unparalleled strength in offence and defence. Germany is going to lay down two of these great vessels each summer and France the equivalent to one annually. The programme of three *Dreadnoughts* which the Board of Admiralty have recommended to the Government for the present year is the minimum compatible with safety. A similar number of large armoured ships has been announced for next year, and these will have to be *Dreadnoughts*. It is true one of these vessels will not be laid down if at the Hague Conference Germany and France agree to a limitation of armaments, but no such agreement will be come to, so we may take it as settled that three *Dreadnoughts* will be included in the Navy Estimates for 1907-8. The result will be that by 1909, owing to the start we have obtained in building vessels of this unique power, we shall possess a squadron of four *Dreadnoughts*, in addition to the three new 'armoured cruisers,' really swift *Dreadnoughts*, at a moment when European rivals, including Germany, will have not a single vessel of what has been styled 'the new pattern' ready for service; in the following year, when we shall have seven ready, Germany will have only two and France still none, for the six battleships about to be begun will not be ready until 1912.

This, however, is only half, or rather less than half, of the truth. The fact is that the Government has gained a concession to economy largely owing to the result of the Far Eastern war and to the policy of the Board of Admiralty in the past. The eight *King Edward VII.s* of 16,350 tons, each mounting four 12-inch and four 9·2-inch guns, besides quickfirers of little account for battle, the *Lord Nelson* and *Agamemnon* of 16,500 tons, each carrying four 12-inch and ten 9·2-inch guns, the *Dreadnoughts* of 17,900 tons, with ten 12-inch weapons, and the three *Invincibles*, belong more or less to the same class.⁴ They are, on the admission of the naval authorities of the world, the ships of the future—ships to fight at 10,000 yards and develop their full fighting power at that range; in the case of the *King Edwards*, however, only the eight largest guns would be useful at this distance. No other European navy has yet laid down a single ship of this type, indeed, no battleship, it may be repeated, has been commenced in any European shipyard since October last, when the keel-plates of the *Dreadnought* at Portsmouth and the *Satsuma* at Kure were placed in position. These ships caused all the battleship designs throughout the world prepared a year ago to be torn up. Germany, France, Russia, the United States—all nations realise that the *Dreadnought* is the vessel which embodies the lessons of the war in the Far

⁴ Germany has no battleship of over 13,200 tons displacement.

East. Existing battleships in foreign navies were built to the old and now discarded standard; they carry only four big guns of 11 inches or 12 inches, and they develop their full gunfire only when at a range of about 6,000 yards. Three years hence we shall have at sea seventeen ships more or less conforming to the new type. We owe this to the foresight and enterprise of the Admiralty in the past. 'But what,' it may be asked, 'is to be said to the new German programme and the French proposals?' Not a single German or French battleship of the new type has been begun. These new proposals are danger-signals of the future—but not the very immediate future! We can afford to watch patiently these projects take practical shape.

In face of these facts it is quite impossible to justify the dissatisfaction which has been expressed with the Government's ship-building programme, under which six improved *Dreadnoughts* will be commenced within eighteen months. Its provision of battleships is sufficient for the immediate necessities of the Empire's defence.

Another phase of Admiralty policy which has aroused a good deal of criticism, for the most part sadly ill-informed, is the determination to make certain changes in the distribution of the fleet. A complete reorganisation of the squadrons at sea was made two years ago. Mobility is the essential character of naval defence, and, as the game of diplomacy progresses and the international situation varies, so the distribution of ships should be altered to suit the new circumstances. Until the present Board of Admiralty carried out their scheme of reorganisation of the fleet nearly two years ago the distribution of naval power had remained unchanged for many years, although the political circumstances had radically altered. We had a large proportion of officers and men in distant parts of the world in non-fighting ships. In December 1905 a concentration of power in Home waters was effected, as it was recognised that this was the only probable scene of trouble; the storm centre had shifted from southern to northern waters. The squadrons of weak ships which had hitherto been kept in the North Atlantic, the North Pacific, and the South Atlantic, ships which were neither strong enough to fight nor swift enough to run away if assailed, were withdrawn, and with the officers and men thus set free and placed in new ships the squadrons in and about the British Isles were greatly strengthened, and by discarding old and useless men-of-war the Admiralty were able to organise a new system for maintaining efficient ships in reserve in a state of warlike efficiency. The scheme was based upon the determination to render the whole Navy instantly ready for war, and the success of the scheme of redistribution depended upon the realisation of the hopes based upon the new system of keeping ships, not actually of the sea-going squadrons, in commission with somewhat reduced crews. The late Prime Minister, speaking at Glasgow in January 1905, admirably summarised the task which had been accomplished not only

with his full concurrence but owing largely to his strenuous and enlightened action. Referring to the work which the Admiralty had done, he said :—

They have distributed the fighting ships of the fleet in the best strategic manner to deal with any emergency at a moment's notice, and they have done something much more than that. They have so arranged matters that the ships in reserve are not ships, as it were, laid up waiting for a crew, which neither know the ships, nor its machinery, nor its guns, nor the individual peculiarities which make a ship and a machine so like a living and organised being. . . . On every one of the fighting ships of his Majesty which is not a part of the sea-going fleets they have put a nucleus crew, and the nucleus crew consists of everything required to manage a ship, and to fight a ship, excepting only what may be described as the unskilled maritime labour required for the purpose. These nucleus crews take out their ship. They practise the guns of their ship; they are not liable to those inevitable breakdowns which people changing to new machinery for the first time always experience. They have over them an admiral, whose specific duty it is to see that these ships—manned only, I admit, by nucleus crews—are ready at a moment's notice to fight, and the result is—and they could fight, I believe, without any additions to them—that officers, stokers, and gunners, all the skilled members of the crew, are there, and they could work the ship as it is, and they have to practise the ship as it is.

The result of all these changes taken together is that I believe that the fighting power of the British fleet during the first twenty-four hours, let us say, of hostilities with a foreign Power have been augmented, not once nor twice, but threefold.

It was claimed that this new scheme of organisation of the reserve ships would not only tend to efficiency, but would be economical, since the crews on board, apart from the time devoted to drills, would be allowed to keep abreast of the necessary repairs which, if allowed to collect, would entail a large amount of dockyard labour. The plan has been in operation now for nearly two years, and it has more than realised all anticipations. Instead of valuable vessels lying as hitherto in the basins of the dockyards more or less neglected and quite unfit for instant action, every efficient unit of the fleet for two years past has been in charge of a captain and the technical officers on whom the fighting efficiency of the ship would depend in action. These officers, who live on board and not in barracks, include the lieutenants and warrant officers for gunnery, navigation, and torpedo; the chief and senior engineer, the paymaster and doctor. Each ship has also been provided with approximately two-fifths of its full crew, and this proportion includes all the skilled ratings for torpedo, gunnery, navigation, signalling, and repairs. At each port these ships have been placed in charge of a rear-admiral, and periodically they go to sea for cruises, when all the usual war drills are carried out. From time to time these reserve divisions have received surprise orders and been placed on a war footing. On one occasion last summer the order to mobilise was received at the naval ports at three o'clock in the morning, and

in the darkness the additional officers and men proceeded on board and by noon that day each division of the Reserve, fully manned and with complete supplies of coal, ammunition, and stores, was ready to proceed on any mission under the orders of the three rear-admirals of the Reserves. In former years the Reserve ships which were specially mobilised for the manœuvres proved for the most part a sorry collection of 'lame ducks.' Seeing that under the old system officers and men were entirely strange to their ships, and the dockyard staff could not, or at any rate did not, keep abreast of the repairs to the machinery and equipment, no other result was to be looked for. During the manœuvres of last year a very different result was achieved. The ships of the Reserve Divisions proceeded to sea with full crews and proved eminently useful efficient fighting vessels. Experience has shown that Mr. Balfour was not exaggerating when he affirmed that 'this new Reserve scheme had augmented the fighting power of the British fleet not once nor twice, but threefold.'

The action of the Admiralty which has aroused so much interest and no little ignorant criticism is merely a further development of this Reserve scheme. It is now intended to increase the strength of these Reserve divisions, which experience has shown can be placed upon a real war footing at such short notice, and form from them a new Home Fleet, with its headquarters at Sheerness. It is realised that owing to the cordial relations now existing between this country and France, and the friendship which exists between Great Britain on the one hand and the other Mediterranean Powers on the other, it is no longer necessary to keep as large a fleet in the Mediterranean as was formerly done. The *entente cordiale* has become much stronger in the past two years. It gained immensely in strength during the Morocco Conference and all the trouble which subsequently occurred between France and Germany, and at one time seemed likely to lead to a war between the two countries; at the same time our relations with Russia, Spain, Italy, and Austria have greatly improved. In view of the *entente cordiale* the French Republic has determined to withdraw all its battleships from the English Channel. This narrow waterway between the two countries, which has for so many years been the scene of armed preparation for war, has now become a centre of concord. In view of the new political situation France intends to maintain no battleships in the English Channel or the North Sea, and only eight first-class ships in full commission in the Mediterranean. Correspondingly, the Admiralty have decided to reduce the strength of the British fleet in the Mediterranean by two battleships, and two ships are to be withdrawn from the Atlantic fleet, which hitherto has been based upon Gibraltar. These ships will come from southern to northern waters—the same policy as under the late Government. They will join the new Home Fleet, and will be held on the leash. This is, again, the same policy. The Admiralty are also making a

change in the disposition of the Channel and Atlantic fleets. The latter, based on Gibraltar, hitherto has been regarded as the 'pivot' force of the Navy, consisting of the best, largest, and most modern ships, intended to swing either to the north or to the south as a reinforcing squadron as the circumstances of war dictate. It is now intended to put this force, greatly strengthened, actually on duty in the North Sea and English Channel, and the former Channel Fleet—slightly reduced—will become the 'pivot' force, and, in view of the calm in the Mediterranean, it will be moved nearer to the new and very powerful Channel Fleet, which is normally based on Portland. The Atlantic Fleet will have Berehaven, on the south-west coast of Ireland, for its base. By this change the reinforcing fleet will be about sixty hours nearer to the Channel Fleet in case it is needed for co-operation. We relinquish four battleships based on Gibraltar and Malta, but we gain a much more powerful Channel Fleet and bring the 'pivot'—or new Atlantic Fleet—nearly three days' steaming nearer to the English Channel and very much nearer Rosyth. At the same time a new striking force is created, to be called 'the Home Fleet,' with practically full crews and instantly ready for action. Under the new régime, the fleet in the Near Seas will be distributed as follows :

ALWAYS AT SEA

CHANNEL AND NORTH SEA FLEET,

based on the home naval ports, as at present, with Portland and Rosyth as its principal places of rendezvous, will have fourteen battleships; these will include the eight vessels of the *King Edward VII.* class, of 16,350 tons displacement, each with four 12-inch and no fewer than four 9·2-inch guns, and the *Lord Nelson* and *Agamemnon*, sister ships, of 16,500 tons, each with four 12-inch and no fewer than ten 9·2-inch guns (380 lb. projectile), and four other modern battleships of 16,000 tons.

MEDITERRANEAN FLEET,

based on Malta and Gibraltar, will be a homogeneous force of six ships of the *Formidable* class, of 15,000 tons displacement, all modern ships.

With the Channel, Atlantic, and Mediterranean Fleets will be associated fifteen armoured cruisers.

PIVOT OR REINFORCING FLEET

The ATLANTIC FLEET will consist of six modern swift battleships of from 14,000 to 15,000 tons displacement.

Now Base : •Berehaven—320 miles from Portland; about 900 miles from Rosyth; 1,170 miles from Gibraltar.

Old Base : Gibraltar—1,145 miles from Portland; 1,720 miles from Rosyth.

HOME FLEET

(FREQUENTLY CRUISING IN THE NORTH SEA AND WITH HEADQUARTERS AT SHEERNESS)

The Home Fleet, with practically full crews, continually drilling and

periodically proceeding on cruises under its Commander-in-Chief, assisted by three junior admirals, will approximately include :

15 battleships.

14 new and swift armoured cruisers.

The small proportion of officers and men—the latter unskilled ratings—required to bring the complements of these men-of-war up to full strength will be instantly available without a Royal Proclamation calling out the Reserve men.

MOSQUITO FLEET

(UNDER A REAR-ADMIRAL)

Under the new *régime* there will be in commission in Home waters :—

Torpedo-boat Destroyers	110
Torpedo Boats	50
Submarines	30
	190

In addition, there will be eighteen destroyers in the Mediterranean.

SECOND LINE

As a second line, there will be a number of older ships of various types forming a 'Special Reserve,' with a small proportion of their crews.

How, it may be asked, does this disposition of naval forces in Home waters compare with what has been accomplished hitherto ? For the purposes of comparison we may take three periods : (1) the end of last century ; (2) January 1905, when the great redistribution of the fleets occurred ; (3) the new *régime*. At these three periods, the displacement of battleships instantly ready for war in the English Channel and North Sea and the big guns carried appear thus in summary :

	Total Tons Displacement.	Guns carried.
1. 1900 . . .	116,700	Eight 13·5-inch (old) ; twenty-four 12-inch.
2. 1905 . . .	244,200	Sixteen 13·5-inch (old) ; twenty-four 12-inch ; eight 10-inch.
3. 1907 . . .	283,800	Eighty 12-inch ; fifty-two 9·2-inch.

NOTE.—In 1907 we shall have in addition a Home Fleet of armoured ships, manned by the skilled ratings and instantly ready for war ; in 1900 there was no such fleet, and the so-called Reserve—ships mostly tied up in basins at dock-yards—was a delusion and a snare.

In the calculation for 1907 no account has been taken of the *Dreadnought* or of the three *Invincibles*, with a collective broadside fire of thirty-two 12-inch guns, though these ships will shortly join either the Channel or Atlantic Fleet, displacing older and less powerful ships, which will automatically pass into the Home Fleet and thence subsequently into the ordinary Reserve, with skeleton crews.

It will be seen from these statements that the latest changes are a normal development of the naval policy initiated under the Unionist Government two years ago, and it is no discredit to the Board of Admiralty that they will result in further economies.

Economy even in the Fleet is no crime, so long as our supremacy is amply secured, and that is not endangered by this latest unfolding

of Admiralty policy. There is no indication of a retrograde step in war training, no curtailment of the essentials to war efficiency, no plan for placing officers on half-pay to rust, no suggestion that less attention is to be devoted to gunnery, in which the Home Fleet ships, by the way, will participate. At the same time the creation of the Home Fleet, with somewhat lighter service than in the ordinary seagoing fleet, will serve to meet the complaint of some naval officers that the Navy is being overworked. Certainly, life afloat was never more exacting, and never made greater demands on the nerve and mental and physical qualities of officers. The *personnel* of the Fleet will deteriorate if continuous sea service is not varied by periods of less trying duty, and while there is no intention to go back to the barrack-plus-hulk system of housing officers and men not in seagoing fleets, as existed two years ago, the development of the Home Fleet, with a 'Special Reserve' behind it as a second line, will provide a compromise and should lead to officers enjoying increased opportunities for study and research.

Finally, the facts of the naval situation are these : . . .

(1) *In the past twelve months no battleship has been laid down for any European Fleet.*

(2) In this period we have begun and completed the *Dreadnought* and made good progress with the three swift *Dreadnoughts* of 17,250 tons displacement each—the *Invincible*, *Indomitable*, and *Inflexible*, which were laid down early this year.

(3) The Government is definitely pledged to lay down in the next eighteen months six more *Dreadnoughts*, or five if the Hague Conference agrees to a limitation of armaments. This represents a minimum of new construction, but it is a minimum not incompatible with safety.

(4) The seagoing fleets are to be strengthened in the only waters in which in present circumstances they can be required on the outbreak of war, and the best of the Reserve ships—battleships and cruisers—are to have an improved organisation, in fact, become a veritable Home Fleet. It is announced that 'this fleet will be in every respect organised with a view to enhancing its value as a fighting force, and battle practice and other fleet exercises not at present carried out by the Reserve divisions will be introduced. The primary object aimed at will be seagoing efficiency, and for this purpose the cruises of the Home Fleet will be made as frequent as practicable.' The new distribution is a non-aggressive precautionary measure.

Presuming that the Government adheres to its pledges—and there is no justification for a conviction before trial—the nation may remain calm even in face of the continued increase of the German Fleet. We have before us—approximately in 1910 and onwards—a serious struggle for our naval supremacy, but we have a lead. In the meantime those who realise that the Fleet is 'England's all in

all' can do more patriotic service by supporting the Cabinet against assault by a section of its least statesmanlike and most irresponsible supporters than by raising a premature cry of 'Wolf,' 'Wolf.' Let us be Englishmen first and politicians afterwards, and the maintenance of the fleet is an Englishman's first duty as citizen. The Government of to-day realises the significance of British supremacy. Lord Tweedmouth, the First Lord of the Admiralty, has given us his creed: 'It is on the Navy that our existence as a nation rests; it is the sea which separates us from foreign nations, but it is the sea also which binds us to the quiverful of younger nations which has sprung from our loins.' The present Lord Chancellor has reminded us that 'if we lose command of the sea we shall be half starved; if we lose command of the sea we shall be largely reduced to idleness; if we lose command of the sea we can no longer carry.' The Secretary of War has insisted that we must have 'an invincible fleet,' or what the Secretary of State for India has termed 'an all-powerful Navy.' The Chancellor of the Exchequer has warned the nation that without the command of the sea this country will be at the mercy of the enemy; the President of the Local Government Board has stated that 'without it [the fleet] the British Empire would be at an end and its Colonies would be gone;' while the Prime Minister, though he sometimes 'plays to the gallery,' has declared that he is of the 'Blue Water School' and accepts 'in fullest and most complete form the doctrine that it is necessary for this country to hold the supremacy of the seas.' In these confessions of the leading members of the Cabinet we have the doctrine of British Sea-Power, admirably and forcibly expressed; and we are reminded of the penalties of sacrificing our traditional naval position. The public, irrespective of party, may be well content to give all possible support to the naval policy of a Government which has given these pledges. Nothing that has yet occurred justifies the assumption that these statesmen will prove false.

ARCHIBALD HURD.

THE SCOTCH DEER FORESTS

THAT Britain should be the most pleasant place to live in is a great national concern, for otherwise her fortune-making sons beyond seas would be lost to her interests for ever. It is something that our quiet land can attract such men of money as he who made Tammany a power, and ruled New York with a chain of golden links. That is the reason why any loss or appreciation of the deer forests is a very important matter, not only to the owners and prospective tenants, but also to the body politic. In the *Field*, this season, have appeared advertisements offering deer forests at 10*l.* a stag, whereas the old-time average value was 50*l.*, and for some fifteen years has not been much under 30*l.* Of course, not in the best of forests would more than one-third of the 10*l.* or 30*l.* stags bear antlers that by their size or beauty would demand preservation; and yet it is the antlers of the deer alone that attract tenants. If two-thirds of the heads obtained are valueless, the remaining third must be of the value received for the whole, and consequently each of the one-third of fine or moderate heads would cost three times 30*l.*; that is, if the latter were the average price paid for a 'limit' forest. But of the whole there may not, and probably will not, be a 'royal' that has also the quality of grandeur; that is, massiveness, spread, wildness, surface, colour, and evenness. There is not the smallest doubt that to secure a head of this sort the average sportsman would forego half his limit, even when it permitted over one hundred stags to be killed for the season.

For the purpose of this article it is unfortunately necessary to be mercenary, and to inquire just how much (on these facts) a first-rate head is worth to shoot. If it is worth half the hundred deer to secure such a trophy, then, when the rent is worth 30*l.* each, the value must be 1,500*l.* for a single first-rate head. It is only three or four years ago that Mr. Platt, who has been renting forests for the past thirty years, secured his first royal head; and, although the writer has not any knowledge of the class of head this might have been, clearly, even if unique as a trophy, about thirty years' rents of deer forests had been paid before it was secured. The average 'royal' is, after all, only a name for twelve times; and it implies no other qualities. Mr. Platt certainly deserved something far better

than this for all his perseverance, and I sincerely trust he got it. The instance is given merely to show the scarcity even of royal heads, to say nothing of beautiful trophies of the chase.

Deer-stalking sport, more than any other, is one in which the pleasures of anticipation far outweigh the glories of achievement. You start out in the morning figuratively panting to be at them; you spy your ground in feverish repose; you scan the first herd for big antlers with anticipation constrained to inaction; and you execute the arduous stalk with all the energy and suppressed excitement that a girl puts into her first ball. The consummation is nothing in these modern days of Mannlicher repeating rifles, or doubles; if you are a fair shot, you make sure; if you are not, you may have more sport, but of a kind that you would not desire. It is because of the anticipation that the sport in killing a great beast is so much better than in shooting a poor brute that is only fit to distribute amongst the crofters. The sportsmanship is just the same for either, but not the sport, because you want to succeed; you anticipate—a hundred times more for one than for the other. Were it not for this, the shooting of yeld hinds, now left to the foresters to perform in winter, would be just as valuable as stag-stalking in September. But as it is not, as you may get it for about the value of the dead carcase, or about 3*l.* a head, we must look at things as they are, and face the sentiment that governs us and fixes the rents of the deer forests.

But, with all due deference, that is just what the deer-forest owners are not doing—at least not those of them who let their forests from year to year, with limits far in excess of the numbers of fair stags that ought to be killed each season.

The Dukes of Atholl and Sutherland, the Marquis of Breadalbane, Mr. Bibby, Lord Burton, The Mackintosh, and several others have given their opinions that the breed of deer is as good as ever, but that the stags are killed before they have time to come to their prime, and, besides, are starved, by too many being kept upon the ground. But, as might be expected, the gentlemen named above are convinced that there is no deterioration of late years on their own forests, or those they shoot over, but only on those which are over-shot, and over-fed, by too many mouths. It amounts to this: that the first-hand evidence denies degeneration or deterioration; but the second-hand evidence, that is, the opinions of the same witnesses about the general run of deer other than their own, admits deterioration, or rather immaturity, but altogether denies degeneration.

The question arises whether the badly treated forests will do any harm. As immature deer, their stags are little likely to be permitted to invade the sanctuaries of better deer, in other and properly-treated forests. The reason is because an old stag will not be deprived of his harem by a junior, especially by an inferior junior. But if degeneration of the cervine race is not to be expected from modern manage-

ment and the greed for numbers, the good name of Scotch sport is in peril by reason of the yearly tenancies of forests, and the great numbers of poor beasts that are killed to make up the 'limit' numbers.

Some little chance there is that the falling market for this class of forest will prove the remedy, and that the deer will be allowed to grow older because nobody will give heavy prices for the right to shoot small deer. Personally I cannot agree with this view, because I think that wealthy young men are increasing; and, taking a world survey, the supply of young men with money has no limits. America seems to be upon the verge of supplying a generation of men incapable of spending all their money or of adding to it. A worthy citizen in the West, not so long since, called his offspring together, and told them very seriously that they must put down some of their sports; which, he did not care, but the necessity was imperative, as they earned nothing, and as his own earnings 'would not run to it.' Afterwards they met again by appointment.

'Well,' asked the man of commerce, 'have you agreed what is to be done?'

'Yes,' they said.

'I am glad,' said the sire. 'What is it?'

'Well, you see there is only one thing to be done,' replied the eldest hopeful; 'you must work nights.'

As long as this spirit prevails there is hope for the forest-owners; although, perhaps, not as much for the forests and the good name of Scotch red deer.

A large number of men take a forest once in their lives, as an experience or as trophy-hunters, although they do not always know a good head from a bad one. The following conversation once occurred in the shop of a taxidermist much occupied with stag-heads in the season:

'Where fra coom the wee horns, Mac?'

'Ye ken weel where they coom fra; I ae a letter with them asking ma opinion o' them.'

'Ye'll no tell it, Mac, or they will send ye no more; ye'll make up a lee, ye can do that fine.'

'I will no make up a lee for the siller, ye know that weel enow.'

'Will ye no? then ye must just say there's many wor (worse) beasties shot.'

'I will no say that again, whateffer; I haf written that when the last coom, and they were fine compared to that trash.'

'Did ye so? Then ye must just tell yon man that the sight of the horns in the toon will do the forest great guid. Ye need not say the reason o' that; nor that ye are o' the opinion the forest would be the better not to carry a rifle the year, or the year after; there'll be no lee in that, whateffer.'

'A' weel, I will consider o' that. It is the strict truth, whateffer,'

replied the righteous trader ; then he added thoughtfully . . . ‘ an it is cevelety ye maun ’a with the London gentlemens.’

Doubtless the exhibition of more trophies of a kind that did the forest good by stalling off prospective tenants was the result of this strictly truthful civility. After that who would take the place ?

There is no way of improving deer in such a manner as to make immature beasts fine trophies ; but a good deal of crossing of the wild deer with importations from parks, and from the Continent, has been tried ; the resulting offspring have met with approval and disapproval, just as they have been considered from various standpoints. Some Scotsmen have a fear that sentiment and fashion will desert Scotland if there is any suspicion that the antlers of the deer-parks of England are comparable with the wild-bred trophies of the mountains. There is a great deal of prospective truth in this ; but it is not so certain that any existing forest antlers cannot now be matched from the parks to deceive the most expert. If they can, the crossing with park deer for the improvement of weights and heads loses one objection. Personally, I think there are a great many park heads that would pass anybody’s judgment as forest heads. That there are a great many forest heads that could be mistaken for nothing besides, owing to their badness, is a great deal too true.

The great forest-owners who shoot their own deer themselves recommend no crossing except with the pure red deer ; that is, they object to wapiti or any other different species ; then they are also agreed that good stags should be left to become monarchs of the glen and fathers of the herd. In order to do this, it is necessary to spare the young deer, and to shoot first-rate stags only when they are going back in consequence of age. This advice is sound, of course, from the point of view of antler production ; but it has a tendency to destroy the sentiment of the absolute wildness of red deer in the forests, since, in order to carry out the policy, the deer have sires selected for the herds, and these sires are to be watched from year to year by the foresters, and known or named, so as to be spared until they start to go back in quality by reason of old age.

Then all authorities desire the reduction of numbers of dwarf stags ; but where there is a limit of numbers to be killed in the yearly tenancies, it is not possible to suppose that sportsmen of a season will kill dwarf stags in order to make up their limit. They will kill the very best, and all the best, in the forest if they can. It will be the forester’s business to kill the trashy stags at the end of the season ; but this process will not bring the best stags back to life, nor find good mates for the hinds.

It is a very difficult problem ; for the greater the interference to improve the deer, the more is the sentiment of wildness endangered. On the other hand, the less interference there is, the smaller and more valueless the stags become. Either alternative has its evils, but

probably the best course to adopt is to improve the haunches and heads ; secretly, if necessary in the interests of sentiment, for a big park deer has no value in sport, but in any case to improve them. The wildness of the deer is not interfered with by crossing, the blood, no matter where the cross comes from, and nothing but sentiment can be injured thereby. On the other hand, if park deer are not used, but only great beasts from the Carpathians or the Caucasus, the cross would not be to tame deer, but to wilder creatures than any in Scotland, and to those which live always at altitudes beyond that of the summit of Ben Nevis.

In one of the weekly newspapers which best understand such matters, the opinion of *The Mackintosh* was recently quoted with approval. It was to the effect that no park or German deer should be used for a cross. In the same issue *Glenquoich Forest* was quoted as a model of what a forest should be. But, strange to say, Lord Burton when its occupier used park deer with great advantage in this forest, and what he has done many other sportsmen have done also. So much is this the case that a very fine head in the Highland forests suggests a cross of park deer, not necessarily because it looks like one of the turned-out deer, but simply because it is finer than the rest, and has, what everyone desires, more points and greater beam.

Here is an unfortunate dilemma in which the forest-owners find themselves : if they do nothing, their stags are insignificant and decrease in value ; if they do anything which improves them, the best are at once, and because of the improvement, suspected of being connected with tame deer, and lose value.

The crossing is an accomplished fact ; we cannot regard it as a newly-proposed policy, and consider it as such. Very likely it would have been better never to have introduced park deer, and so given rise to the dilemma in which forest-owners find themselves ; but it is too late to consider that now, for it has been done in many forests, and stags wander from one to the other. The fact that has to be faced is that the big heads are now mostly suspected of park origin by some people, although not by all.

Under these circumstances, what is the way out ? It must be one that has two effects : first, the improvement of the Highland stags ; second, the removal of the suspicion that the best Highland forest heads are related to park deer. At one time the wapiti cross was looked upon as hopeful, but that has been given up owing to the experiments of the Duke of Bedford. It was the Duke who first proved that the red and wapiti deer first crosses were fertile ; but it was soon seen at Woburn that, although fertile, they were not desirable. Her Grace of Bedford wrote on one occasion that the resulting deer were wapiti without the size, and red deer without the antlers. Condemnation could go no further.

But the Continental and even the Caucasian red deer are much nearer than the wapiti to the wild Scotch species, and they seem to

contain within them every quality that is wanted in Scotland to improve the deer, and to improve the sentiment of wildness at the same time. Were they let loose in the forests it would be natural for the biggest heads to be traced to them, since they are much finer than park deer. They are also much wilder than the Highlanders, in the sense that they are in no way protected and are never seen for such a purpose by man.

With such an enormous range for choice of new deer as is given by the Carpathians and the Caucasus, it will be strange if forest-owners cannot improve their stags and the sporting sentiment of wildness of their deer at the same time. At any rate, they have it in their power to abolish the present suspicion that the biggest and best Highland deer owe their grandeur to the blood of tame deer. They can do this whether the cross suggested succeeds or fails, for both sorts are found together, and crossed, in the Carpathians, and why not in Scotland too? Mr. Cameron has expressed the opinion that the Caucasian stag is the ancestral type, and there are good grounds for believing the Scotch deer to be merely degenerate, but of the same race as these massive Eastern beasts with their magnificent trophies.

G. T. TEASDALE BUCKELL.

OBJECT AND METHOD IN LAND LEGISLATION

THE necessity for prompt attention to land reform is in no way dependent on the exigencies of party politics, but derives its urgency from such considerations as the long-continued dwindling of country population; the decreasing value of land, which Denmark testifies to be no inevitable accompaniment of Free Trade; the enormous imports, whether of timber or of dairy and garden produce, most of which could equally well be produced at home, and, finally, the overcrowding of our towns, with their high rents and rates.

The land question naturally divides itself into two parts, the one dealing with urban and the other with rural land. The urban problem embraces, besides the readjustment of the incidence of rates between house and site and on unoccupied land, the right of a community to possess the ground values it creates. The rural problem deals with the tenure and distribution of land, its profitable employment in small quantities, the larger question of State afforestation over millions of acres of waste or rough pasture, the provision of adequate agricultural and sylvicultural training and experiment, and the incidence of local and imperial taxation.

Nearly the whole subject is covered by proposals in print or in project, partly produced by Government or enjoying its approval, in part repudiated by it, and in part unnoticed save by political groups or individuals. The subject needs to be surveyed and grasped as a whole, so that the end pursued may be rather the good of the entire community than the advantage or disadvantage of any particular section. It is, indeed, a national misfortune that no Government has attempted to face the land question in all its complexity, while every Government tries to bribe supporters by tinkering with some part of it. Consequently, there is no orderly progress in land reform towards a realised and accepted goal, and small capacity on the part of the public to judge between what is just and expedient on the one hand or misconceived and unjust on the other.

The urban question presses, and is prepared for treatment. It has been repeatedly subjected to exhaustive inquiry; the minority

reports of the Local Taxation Commission, presented by the Chairman and the joint secretaries to the Treasury, suggest a sound starting-point for the separation of house and site values and for the rating of vacant land. By such readjustment some relief—perhaps neither great nor immediate—would come to the house owner or occupier, and building land would come quicker into the market. The Building Lands (Scotland) Bill assumes that future ground values should accrue to the communities creating them, and, while leaving existing values to existing owners, it endows town and county councils with powers to secure prospective increment, save when this is due to an owner's enterprise. It may be urged that the inefficiency of communal control is the real drawback to communal ownership; that the essential feature of a well-conducted municipal estate office is as yet unknown, and that the supervision of local management by the Local Government Board is perfunctory and ineffectual. Nevertheless, the acknowledged success of German cities in the acquisition, control, and rating of land is an incentive to action, for it proves that the difficulties are not insurmountable, and that it is possible for local bodies, stimulated by a central department, to carry out building policies and to regulate the development of their towns upon sound economical lines.

Other palliatives suggest themselves for overcrowding—better communications, cheaper building, a stiffer intolerance of slum property; while the elimination of private profit from the retail liquor trade would supply funds for many public objects, the costs of which the ratepayer now has to bear; but, in addition, the country expects measures which shall deal promptly, justly, and thoroughly with the urban land question. There is at present little prospect of these expectations being fulfilled; reports, recommendations, Bills, have been swept aside, and yet another inquiry instituted to investigate the merits of a brand-new Rating Bill which was carefully docked of its principal provision before being submitted to the Committee.

The rural land question is easier understood, and, though it has several heads—tenure, small holdings, and State afforestation—it presents a comparatively simple problem, which this Parliament, after the manner of its predecessors, has not been slow to approach in haphazard style. At present we have reformers advocating methods which would bring about results wholly opposed to those they profess to have in view; such, for instance, are the enthusiasts who advocate a policy of small holdings and propose at the same time to give fixity of tenure to large farmers.

The Robartes Bill, so hotly promoted by Lord Carrington, contains excellent provisions, lacks others, and is likely to be shorn of several which have already been condemned by the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture. The Bill as it appeared was designed for England; but Scotland, with its very different land system, was unexpectedly

included. The Government has also introduced a Small Holder's Bill for Scotland without waiting for the report of the Committee whose investigations were already concluded. This measure, though sound in its general scope, is in some essential details open to destructive criticism.

If our object be the welfare of agriculture, then the case of the large farmer can be easily dealt with. He needs amendments to the Ground Game and Agricultural Holdings Acts to remedy acknowledged deficiencies, more freedom in cultivation, and relief from payment of statutory compensation due to the outgoing tenant. What he does not need is any avoidable increase in his payments as an incoming tenant, or in the costs of arbitration. These burdens, already serious for a depressed industry, are augmented by this Bill, in spite of the serious nature of such an incubus having been well illustrated in the agricultural history of Ireland. The Bill proposes to award compensation to an outgoing tenant in the event of capricious eviction, which would be found an unworkable limitation; moreover, to legislate for the exception is not business, and if attempted would produce an astonishing law of tenure. There are bad owners and bad occupiers—both are the exception; and an occupier has more power over an owner's land than an owner over an occupier's capital, while a good tenant is usually as thoroughly appreciated by a landlord as a good landlord by a tenant. There is no necessity to protect either.

The principle of dual ownership which appears in these Bills is sometimes supported as a first step towards the dismemberment of large estates; and no doubt the underlying object, that of securing an occupying proprietary, is a worthy one in itself, but it is one which, if accepted, must be proceeded with as a distinct policy, and not by indirect attack. A sharper graduation of death duties, or other well-known methods, would end large estates with least pain to the victim, and without involving agricultural and allied interests in a chaos of litigation and disturbance, to conclude with some measure of expropriation, the cost of which would be immeasurably greater than in Ireland. Moreover, such a change would be viewed as a whole, from the establishment of a peasant proprietary to the departure of the landowner, with his standards of public service, and the disappearance with him of the great pleasure-grounds of the country. Apart from such vast schemes, there is for all practical purposes no need for dramatic departures in land tenure, and, unless the sole object is the overthrow of our land system at all costs, it is folly to effect the maximum of irritation with the minimum of result, or to risk transforming a simple matter into a complicated problem through a mania for unnecessary interference.

The country land question bears on many social problems intimately affecting the life of the nation. Rural depopulation, the growing

class of urban unemployables, the permanent character of these disquieting phenomena, are alike affected by the distribution and use of land. While the quantity of waste or half-wasted land, much of it suited to sylviculture, some of it to intense cultivation; the extent of British imports coming from small holdings and large forests across the North Sea; the extravagance of equipment and absence of profit on many large farms, are all facts suggestive of the direction in which we must look for a solution of some of our difficulties.

Travelling from London into Scotland, the absence of population from the land is as remarkable as its aggregation in a few centres, and the conclusion is inevitable that something is wrong with the distribution of the people. A successful system of small holdings will not be obtained, however, by a mere subdivision of land. Not only are co-operation, agricultural training, and organisation essential, but it is imperative that reliable experiments should be conducted by the State, so that definite proof should be forthcoming of the productivity and profit-making capacity of small holdings. It is obvious that to parcel out land in such quantities and under such conditions that it will return a scant living to its occupier or entail his dependence on some subsidiary industry or on rate relief, would be a retrograde step, and one from which neither the individual nor the community as a whole would derive any benefit. Outside the fruit and market-garden districts, where progress, partly through the aid of syndicates, is already assured, adequate experiment could be economically carried out by utilising Crown lands, some of which—such as London ground rents—could be sold for re-investment in suitable localities. For the greater part of Britain small holdings are not at present practicable; much pasture land is unsuitable, and arable farms cannot often be dispersed, if by reason only of the capital sunk in equipment, which represents usually the net rent of the farm. Where small holdings already succeed they will probably be multiplied, for remunerative cultivation of the soil is to the landlord's interest. In other suitable localities owners, agents, and farmers may for various reasons, good, bad and indifferent, be disinclined for new departures; it is in such districts that some agency is needed to co-operate with owners and with the general population. It will be generally admitted that county councils are not an effective agency, but in devising a substitute it is to be remembered that the agricultural interest is a practical force, which should be utilised and reckoned with. It exercises a considerable influence, and its co-operation is worth having. A great deal can be done, without declaring war on large owners and farmers, by legislating to supplement, not to destroy, private ownership. What we need is an effective authority working alongside of individual enterprise, stimulating and abetting its efforts and supplying its deficiencies.

The first move should be to establish a commission for the three

countries. Each body should have powers of compulsory purchase, with the right of control and disposal; it should value rents for small holdings, and grant loans for equipment within well-defined limits. In this way small holdings and allotments would be created where wanted, and safeguarded under forms of tenure suited to the locality. Freeholders might be established as in Worcester, yearly tenants as in Lincoln, perpetual tenants under contract as in the Highlands, or leaseholders as in the Lowlands. Thus one *sine qua non* of success would be guaranteed, for, if one thing is clear, it is the need for flexibility and diversity of tenure; and this the State can give through State ownership alone, for to limit State co-operation to interference in the relations of owner and occupier involves, among other evils, a cast-iron tenure applied to all alike, irrespective of conditions and circumstances.

No large purchase fund would, so far as we yet know, be needed, for the existence of a commission with compulsory purchase powers would greatly stimulate voluntary agreement, under which, as Major Craigie's statistics show, something is already being done.

The commission could give existing small holdings, say under a 50*l.* rental, a permanent status and security against undesirable amalgamation. To avoid dual ownership the holding, *not the tenant*, should have a valued rent. Additional protection for unexhausted crop values would be needed in the case of small holdings under fruit or other forms of intensive cultivation. The commission could stimulate subdivision by loans; but public money should be advanced with caution, for financial failure will assuredly prejudice land reform in the eyes of the taxpayer; nor is any public authority likely to equal private control in the management and supervision of expenditure upon land. Its tendency is to look too much to the mere disbursement of public funds as a remedy in itself, and to shirk the trouble and forethought by which alone such expenditure can be productive. A land system financed by the State has its dangers; and it would be unwise lightly to discard existing ownership, or to curtail incentives to the investment of private capital in the equipment of farms, until experience gained through a land commission proves the existing system to be a failure or produces satisfactory evidence of the superiority of occupying ownership. Then large loans will be needed for the final expropriation on a large scale of the existing landlords.

A scheme of rural land reform relying mainly on individual enterprise, strengthened by a land commission, entails the minimum of cost to the State, secures the continuance and increase of small holdings, and avoids dual ownership, of which the evils are insufficiently appreciated. That system cuts at the root of real ownership, with its satisfactions, responsibilities, and corresponding incentive to effort, and it places the nominal owner and the occupier in a position where

a war of interests must take the place of copartnership—a result which resolves itself into legal proceedings and ‘ganging pleas,’ costly to agriculture, before a tribunal costly to the country. Dual ownership is a system destitute of all permanency—it is but a temporary expedient to stave off ultimate settlement, and has never been accepted as final by either side to the duality. It must further be remembered that there is no analogy between the land system of Britain and that of Ireland, parts of the Highlands, or of Wales. Racial troubles are absent, and while the rental of Ireland is mainly a prairie rental, that of Britain is mainly interest on permanent improvements.

The principle of dual ownership is to be found in two provisions of Mr. Sinclair’s Bill—those which give powers to the commission to hire land compulsorily and grant to the tenant fixity of tenure. Compulsory hiring is dual ownership under another name; while to confer fixity of tenure upon a casual occupier is but to transfer property from one person to another without necessarily conferring any benefit on ‘the’ community. Both provisions entail a uniform law of tenure on rigid, identical lines, for if the State begins to redistribute private property, especially when it represents the result of expenditure by a *ci-devant* owner, it must in all fairness give legal definition to such rights as may be conceded to him; even when such rights fall to be defined, as under this Bill, by creditors with power to determine the obligations of their debtors towards those from whom they have been enabled to obtain a forced loan. Such dual ownership is an artificial and cast-iron copartnership, in which are the seeds of disintegration, and which can only last until political pressure sweeps away the last rights of the nominal owner or until the vicious nature of the expedient is so developed that some general measure of expropriation to re-establish ownership becomes inevitable. No amount of amiable platitude can make dual ownership under ordinary British conditions and on a wide enough scale anything but a struggle of interests and a public disaster.

Such intervention has its moral disadvantages, for it has been proved, both in the West Highlands and in Ireland, that the abrogation by the State of the individual’s contracts and engagements undermines his conception of commercial honesty, and leads inevitably to the repudiation by him of remaining obligations. Peasant proprietorship, on the other hand, intensifies a man’s sense of the inviolability of contracts, increases his respect for property, and raises the standard of commercial morality throughout the country.

It may be said that compulsory hiring has worked well in the Highlands, and has there been accepted as a permanent settlement. But in this specific case common pasture and game values were practical impediments to expropriation. Hereditary tenure was customary,

fixtures were as a rule the tenant's, and land was held everywhere under much the same conditions. It was a question merely of extending these crofter townships, and where fresh crofts were created the principle of purchase was recognised. It is a sound principle, susceptible of wide extension, that the State or community should take land needed for the public service at a fair price. It is not sound or expedient that it should appropriate the control of private property without obligation to return its capital value. On the other hand, with a land commission operating by purchase, owner, occupier, and State can all co-operate in effecting changes which need be limited only by expediency.

To foster every form of training or experiment for agriculture, England and Scotland, both need boards strengthened, as in Ireland, by an infusion of the practical element; our departments are at present too exclusively controlled by Treasury and other Civil Service experts, who are often singularly ignorant of rural needs. The small holder cannot really compete in ordinary farming, either with his capitalist brother or foreign rival, without such guidance, and the large farmer would be all the better for it. If efficiency in departmental administration is necessary to all, so is a revision of the incidence of local taxation upon agricultural land. Official reports are well summarised by Professor Nicholson in his recent treatise, which shows that the excessive comparative rating of land constitutes a serious drag upon cultivators under the present or any other land system. This would seriously hamper small holders, unless it is proposed that they, like the crofter, should escape a large proportion of these local taxes, which must then be added to the burden of the other ratepayers.

The unquestioned sphere for State land management is in silviculture, where communal control can alone secure that continuous good management for lack of which three or four million acres of British woodlands are now worked at a dead loss; it alone can provide the capital and the scientific training, for want of which an even greater area remains unafforested. The State could buy up this area and plant 100,000 acres annually for the next eighty years. Barren lands would become centres of the timber trade, and if Scotland were afforested like Southern Germany the saw would support as many as the plough, and the State would have a timber revenue from this country alone of four or five millions a year. Silviculture has, indeed, a more direct bearing upon rural prosperity than have small holdings, and yet the State, which alone can undertake this national work, steadfastly persists in a policy of negation.

It would sometimes seem as if one Government deemed it unnecessary either to legislate or to administer, and another imagined that by legislating in haste it can administer at leisure. As a matter

of fact, land reform turns quite as much on competent administration as on new laws, and requires free co-operation and competition between the State, the community, and the individual. It is to the State that we have in the main, to look for an extension of sylviculture, to the local authority for urban land reform, and to the individual, aided by an efficient department, for agricultural progress.

R. MUNRO FERGUSON.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE AND THE LAND TENURE BILL

THERE are a good many worthy people in this country much imbued with a respect for Parliamentary institutions, and not easily excited by the present cries of party politicians bent on obtaining votes, and to whom a general election has been hitherto a source of mild interest which affected them in various degrees, according to their temperament, the state of their liver, and the fact of whether or not some relation or friend in whom they were interested was endeavouring to enter the House of Commons. This sort of attitude has always been the despair of election agents and of gentlemen seeking the suffrages of the electors, and it may be said that it certainly does argue either a lack of conviction or an indifference at once unpatriotic and unthoughtful; but whatever may be our opinion as to this state of mind, we must all allow that it is very common and that it has also great advantages—advantages which have been evident at almost every stage of our country's existence. These sorts of men do not easily lose their heads, and, like the ballast at the bottom of a vessel, they tend to keep the ship of State on an even keel when the storms of political passion and party warfare have proved too much for other barques less happily balanced and equipped. As a healthy body tends, in the long run, to produce a healthy mind, so in a State the presence of a large proportion of its people for many generations, steadily engaged in performing their accustomed duties each in his own station of life, content with possibly small ambitions, but yet guided partly by principle, partly by habit in minding their own business, has engendered a general sense of security which has had an influence, I believe, immeasurable in the moulding and creation of the national character. What that character is has been written all over the map of the world. A love of home and a belief in the blessings of liberty, and an experience of the fact that no true liberty can exist where property is not also secure, has led Englishmen to extend to those countries which either their sword has conquered or their enterprise has colonised the advantages which they prize themselves, and which the best and

the wisest among them have made it their life's object to consolidate and to extend; for with the liberty of the individual combined with security of property they know a pillar is fashioned on which rests confidence and credit, enterprise and energy, and very many other things not only needful but essential to the maintenance of Empire. But, and it is a dreadful thought, in England, the very cradle of these principles and the most striking example of the advantage of them which the world has ever seen, the question is now beginning to be asked, 'Is property secure?' 'Shall we reap what we have sown?' or 'Will a few politicians who think, because the inevitable swing of the pendulum has given them a majority, that they have what they are pleased to call "a mandate" —will they be able to undo what centuries of self-sacrifice and honest endeavour have built up?' Now that persons should be gravely debating such questions is surely a most serious matter; and when already in the last few months, thousands if not millions of pounds have been taken from British securities and invested abroad, when Consols have fallen lower than they have ever been in the memory of man, we may surely say with Hamlet, there is something very rotten in the state of Denmark, and the sooner we see to it before it is too late the better.

The Radical Government have been in power for a little more than eight months, and already England, Africa and Egypt are all in a state of unrest. Why is this? Is it owing to their measures? No, for they have not yet passed any of consequence. Then what is it? The answer is that they have engendered already a feeling of insecurity not merely in England but throughout the British Empire, and by so doing have done a mischief more dangerous than any diplomatic blunder, than any administrative failure or mistake. So much for generalities.

Now, as an example of a measure which, comparatively small in itself, yet produces the feeling to which I have alluded, let us take the Land Tenure Bill. Of course I am not so foolish as to attribute unrest in Africa or Egypt as the result of this measure introduced by a private member in the House of Commons and supported by the Government, but I do maintain that it is a fair example of legislation that not only does a wrong and creates an injustice by its own provisions, but also alarms, and by alarming injures to a very great extent the vital interests of numbers of people who, at first sight, one thinks its provisions would not affect, and by so doing knocks a brick (it may be a small one) from the foundations of our prosperity; for confidence means prosperity, while a want of it, if long continued, means ruin. It is not necessary for the purpose of this article to go into all the provisions of this unjust measure, and I purpose only to touch upon those which are relevant to my contention; and, keeping this limitation in view,

the first thing that is evident is the entire one-sidedness of its proposals. Take, for instance, Clause 2, which says that 'when a tenant has sustained any damage from game that he has not a lawful right to kill, he shall at any time of the tenancy be entitled to compensation from his landlord for such damage, and any agreement to the contrary shall be void.'

Now (ignoring the practical difficulties of being able at all times to assess and separate the damage done by rooks and pigeons from that alleged to be done by pheasants), suppose a tenant has taken a farm on the understanding that he makes no claim for damage done by game (and if he agrees to do so it is probable that he is satisfied with an arrangement which enables him to obtain the use of the land for less money), is it not monstrous that the law should step in, and while keeping the landlord to his side of the bargain should exempt the tenant from a portion of his, putting thereby a premium on dishonesty? Of course, it may be said that nobody in future would insert a condition which could not be enforced; but then, what is the result? The landowner demands the full value of the land in order that by the additional rent he may protect himself from the consequences of the claim for compensation, and then who benefits? Not the tenant, and not the landlord. The former pays more for his land, the latter is harassed by this ridiculous restriction, and both are possibly involved in costly litigation, in which case the gainer is neither the owner nor the occupier, but the outsider in the shape of the professional man employed. Surely the interference between two presumably sane persons in the arrangement of what is entirely their own business is as unstatesmanlike as it is vexatious and shortsighted. I am well aware that in the late Sir William Harcourt's Hares and Rabbits Bill freedom of contract was in the same manner made illegal; but two wrongs do not make one right, and it is an open question whether that measure has conferred any benefit on the tenant farmer. I know of farms much injured by the rabbits which the tenants have preserved—not merely the crops injured, but the value of the farm for many years to come, from the fences having been practically destroyed. But unjust, unnecessary, and absurd as the clause to which I have referred undoubtedly is, there is another equally unfair and far more dangerous. I refer to Clause 5, which says—

Where the landlord unreasonably and without good and sufficient cause terminates or refuses to grant a renewal of the tenancy, or unreasonably and without due and sufficient cause requires more onerous conditions as terms of such renewal, the tenant on quitting the holding shall be entitled to compensation for disturbance, any agreement to the contrary notwithstanding, which shall mean, in addition to any compensation due to the tenant for improvements under any Act or agreement, a further compensation in respect to the loss which shall be sustained by the tenant by reason of quitting the holding.

The clause goes on to say that in the event of any difference arising as to the reasonableness or insufficiency of the cause of removal, or as to the amount of compensation, the matter shall be settled by an arbitrator.

Comment seems almost superfluous on such a proposal. In the first place, what one arbitrator may think 'reasonable and sufficient cause,' another may deem entirely insufficient and frivolous; and, in the second place, if an owner is bound to renew a lease when it falls in, under pain of paying a large sum in compensation, it is obvious that he can no longer be said to be the sole owner of the land in question, and the pernicious system of dual ownership which has worked so disastrously in Ireland is established in this country. Again, it should be noticed that the landlord cannot make an agreement with the tenant even if the latter is willing to contract out of this absurdly unjust enactment. It will be noticed also that for many improvements, such as repairs to the buildings, draining, water-schemes, &c., the consent of the landlord is not necessary (Clause 7), though when the tenant leaves the farm the unfortunate landlord is in any case obliged to pay for them (Clause 1). When one reads such proposals as these—proposals which can only be made in order to protect bad tenants from the results of their own negligence at the expense of the owner of the soil, or out of spite to a class which has always been Conservative in politics—it cannot surprise any thoughtful person that the mere threat of legislation so revolutionary and so grossly unfair is causing alarm throughout the country. It is felt that a power will be put in the hand of the unscrupulous tenant by which he may always wring from his landlord compensation for so-called unreasonable disturbance. He will reason in this way: 'I am anxious to give up the farm now. If I give my landlord notice, I shall only get compensation for unexhausted improvements which I have effected; but if I compel *him* by making myself obnoxious (which I can do in many ways—about the game, for instance), and oblige *him* to give *me* notice in sheer self-defence, *then* I shall get additional compensation for disturbance, as I can always pose as the poor man anxious not to leave the homestead, which I have become attached to, and where I have been so long, &c.' Of course, there are thousands of honest tenant farmers who would scorn such reasoning; but, on the other hand, there are bad tenants as well as bad landlords, and to the former, by this Bill, a weapon is given of which they will certainly not fail to take advantage.

Of course, the first effect of such legislation, by curtailing the rights of landowners and diminishing the amenities of the possession of land, will be to depreciate its value, and if this is the case—and competent authorities estimate the depreciation at from 25 to 30 per cent.—one of the first things which will occur will be that where there are mortgages on a property, and the margin is not

large, the mortgagees will foreclose, and ancient inheritances which have been the pride and pleasure of generations of English country gentlemen will pass for ever into the hands of strangers, or, no longer the sources of hospitality and charity, but closed and deserted, will remain as examples of what practical harm ignorant and spiteful legislation can accomplish; while in the case of the estate with few or no encumbrances, whose owner can afford to look upon land merely as a luxury, the obvious course will be for him to take the whole or a large portion of the property into his own hands, giving notice to the tenants, for the law does not allow him to make a bargain with them, however willing both parties might be to do so, and in this case the tenants will indeed appraise at its proper value such grandmotherly legislation.

To some this may seem an exaggerated picture, and no doubt these results would not be at once apparent were the Bill to pass to-morrow; but I am firmly of opinion that a measure of this sort, combined with the Finance Act of the late Sir William Harcourt, will hit the landed interest very hard indeed. Of course, there is a certain class of Radical who wishes for nothing better than to do this; but does the country wish it? Do the 7,000,000 who voted at the last General Election for the Unionist party (as compared with the 7,500,000 who voted for the Radicals) wish it? And, lastly, do the tenant farmers, for whose benefit the Bill is supposed to be intended, do they wish it?

That is a question about which personally I have no doubts whatever. The bulk and vast majority of the people in these islands do not wish to see any injustice perpetrated or any real hardship inflicted on any class in the community, and certainly legislation which introduces discord where harmony existed before, which remedies no real grievance, and which can only cause ill-feeling and litigation, is the last thing which honest, fair-minded English men and women wish to see effected. But how can they now make their wishes felt on this and other kindred topics? However disappointed they may be, however horrified at the actions of the present Government, they are almost powerless until a General Election gives them an opportunity of recording their opinions. Can it be wondered at that confidence is sorely shaken, and that daily is growing up an anxious fear as to what interest, what species of property is safe? Property in land is of all property that which forms the very basis of society. Besides private owners, thousands of pounds which represent the hardly-earned savings of working men are invested in it, particularly in the north. Many hospitals draw their income from this source. Any violent depreciation in its value will affect injuriously thousands of people who never before realised the extent to which their interests were involved in that species of property, which they are taught by Radical agitators to consider as a luxury, unjustly the almost exclu-

sive property of the rich. But even if this were the case, if land belonged exclusively to a very small and privileged class, would that be the least excuse for Bills of this nature? If so, we shall soon have measures of confiscation and robbery justified on the ground that, after all, only a comparatively small number are to be robbed, that the weak must go to the wall, or, to quote the present Prime Minister, 'that minorities must suffer.' One bulwark, and one only, still remains to protect the country from such calamities. The House of Lords still has the power, if it choose to exert it, to amend or to veto such legislation. That it will have the courage of its convictions and amend or veto the Land Tenure Bill and all such measures until the Government are forced to appeal to the country is apparently the only solution of the problem; but all must agree that it is a most unfortunate one, and that there should be a quarrel between the two Houses would be almost a national misfortune. But it appears to be the lesser of two evils, by far the greater being that the House of Lords should give way, fearing worse things to come, and that it should accept the position that the late Lord Salisbury sarcastically defined as acting like a paid clerk to say 'Amen' to the decisions of the House of Commons. May we never see such a spectacle! At the same time it must in fairness be allowed that there is a measure of truth in the assertion often made by the Liberal party that the House of Lords passes any Bill, however Radical, if initiated by a Conservative Government, and throws out any Bill which a Radical Government sends up for its consideration. This, no doubt, is rather an over-statement of the case, but few can deny it entirely. It is one of the results of our system of party government, which obliges both parties to play to the gallery, and tempts them to shelter themselves under platitudes as to the necessity of 'marching with the times, &c.,' in order to make the party to which they belong popular at all costs. Let us hope that one of these days will arise a National party composed of sensible men drawn from both great parties in the State, whose leaders will not be mere politicians, however adroit, but will be statesmen who will, by putting principle before party, by showing an unbending and unbroken front to all Socialistic proposals, reassure that large and growing body of opinion which feels that unless a policy is adopted which shall not only be strictly fair and honest, but also definite and constructive, a policy which shall turn men's thoughts and energies from meddling with each other's property to larger and more Imperial questions, we shall soon lose not only our great position in the councils of the world, and much that is historic and valuable in our home and particularly in our country life, but also that great asset in the forces of an Empire, a possession without which it cannot prosper, national confidence.

ROBERT GRESLEY.

DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS IN CANADA

I.—THE MARITIME PROVINCES

DALHOUSIE University holds a commanding position, which is the natural result of its own efforts. The sectarian places of education of Nova Scotia are the (Church of England) King's College, the (Roman Catholic) College at Antigonish, the Methodist Seminary at Sackville (actually in New Brunswick), and the very fine (Baptist) Seminary at Wolfville. It has been left to the Presbyterians to lay down, and sternly act upon, the sound university principles of non-sectarian, non-political governance; and, in consequence, Dalhousie stands a head and shoulders above all other degree-granting institutions in Nova Scotia. A man's religion is the last thing that they inquire about in the university. Nor is this latitudinarianism. According to the Dalhousie view, it is a poor compliment to the training of childhood and youth to assume that a man's religious views are so shaky that he cannot be trusted in manhood without a priest at his elbow.

One says 'degree-granting institutions' because it is difficult to describe them otherwise. Dalhousie itself is described on its official calendar as 'College and University.' According to English views it can hardly be both; or, rather, the greater includes the less. We think in England (and perhaps correctly) that the stately privilege of granting degrees ought to be enjoyed by universities only. On this side of the Atlantic the English view is hardly tenable, because numerous bodies of little note or distinction are entitled to call themselves universities. There is, therefore, a great deal to be said for the view that the public must look out for itself. The Dalhousie attitude of mind would appear to be this:

If our principles are sound (as we believe that they are) and our system is adequate and sincere, the natural result will be that our degree will rank highest in the Maritime Provinces. If other degrees are more sought for, it will be because we have fallen away from our principles, or because others have surpassed us. Meanwhile every house in the place may call itself a university and grant degrees, so far as we are concerned.

This is a lofty tone to adopt, and Dalhousie has reaped the material advantage which does not always follow the adoption of a lofty tone. The present 'University' began its career on the 'Parade,' in the buildings now occupied by the City Building—the Guildhall of Halifax. It then moved to its present site between Morris Street and Spring Garden Road, and of course the usual wiseacres were not wanting who said : 'You will never want a building of that size.' That building is now crammed with eager students. 'What to do next?' is the pressing cry. 'Shall we add to our present building? or shall we move to a more ornamental site? In either case we want three hundred thousand dollars at once.' One often hears the present site decried on the ground of its ugliness. In fact it resembles Mason College at Birmingham; but as it stands in the midst of a vast open space its bareness is more apparent. Ugly or not, no university depends on its architect for its prosperity. Brains, not bricks, make a successful university, so Dalhousie need fear nothing.

The austere academical tone of the University finds expression in the deliberate maintenance of a mutilated faculty. It is possible to obtain the degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts, but not the degree of Doctor. A Master of Arts who desires his Doctorate—that natural goal of a lettered man's ambition—must emigrate. With belligerent modesty Dalhousie says that it is better for the ambitious student to see something of a wide university life. It goes further, and maintains that it is incompetent to supervise studies for a Doctorate. The first self-denying ordinance may stand, but a protest must really be entered against the second. In one subject, at least—history—much classical work remains to be done in connection with the gates of Canada, while in the sister-study of geography part of Newfoundland is still marked unexplored.

As touching history, there appears to be no organised course of study bearing upon the British Empire. The fall of the Roman Empire, and the Empire of Alexander, are thrilling romances; but they seem a little 'remote,' even in the Old World. Surely, in the New World, subjects of the British Empire would find the British Empire a more grave and profitable study. At the present moment, the University is taking the lead in a move of great importance, and is determined to bring the work of the schools into direct line with the work of the University. Much attention is paid (perhaps deservedly) to Latin grammar; less attention to the study of history. Yet the latter subject has merit; considerable merit, even as a means of training young minds to think and express their thoughts. We find that from fifteen to sixteen a young Nova Scotian will be studying 'Canadian History,' from sixteen to seventeen 'British History,' and from seventeen to eighteen 'Ancient History.' When he enters the University he spends the first year over 'Mediæval and Modern History to 1555,' the second year over 'Modern History from 1555,'

and the third year over 'English History from 1603 to 1688.' A graduate who survives this mental steeplechase cannot complain. He has been made acquainted with narrative history in six aspects; if none of these appeal to him, he can have no historical aptitude. But why ignore the British Empire?

The University has 343 students. It draws upon the population of Nova Scotia (with Cape Breton) and Prince Edward Island; say 400,000 souls. For reasons social and political, Newfoundland remains without the charmed circle of Dalhousie influence, and looks rather towards England. Academic emigrants find their way to Harvard or Johns Hopkins; to anywhere rather than to Oxford or Cambridge. In England, 1,000,000 is the recognised Privy Council University unit of population, but Dalhousie will have doubled its size long before the Maritime Provinces will have doubled their population.

At the present moment Halifax (and Nova Scotia) are depressed by the withdrawal of the British naval and military forces. Everybody was sorry to see them go; presumably there were sound service reasons for taking this important step. With respect to the University the point is that the country now finds itself face to face with the serious problem of the Army. The day of paid armies is over; any country which hopes to hold its own must make its army a national affair, and not a highly technical profession reserved for the pursuit of a few experts. In this direction the University is already moving. The powerful Faculty of Engineering proposes to invite its students to enrol themselves as a corps of communication engineers. In time of war the highly complicated field-engineering would still remain to be done by a corps of experts; but a compact body of competent engineers of communication would be immediately available. The scheme is hardly elaborated as yet. It is an excellent example of the freedom of action secured by the adoption of sound university principles. It is also an example of the initiative and intelligence of Dalhousie and of its determination to take the lead in all matters which bring together Life and Learning.

It would not be right to omit King's College from this notice of the university system of the Maritime Provinces. 'King's' claims primatial rank by virtue of its antiquity and its royal charter. There is no denying either the one or the other; but, at the present moment, it has more teachers than students. All Churchmen feel its position and regret it; they mean to struggle on, and to rival, if possible, Dalhousie. Courage always commands respect, and it can achieve much when allied with common sense. What, then, can 'King's' do, to extricate itself from its present absurd position? Perhaps the two following letters may help us, by explaining how it contrived to lose all the advantages which might have been expected to accrue from august patronage and a long start.

(1)

King's Coll., Dec. 26, 1819.

DEAR SIR,—Being under the necessity of attending a marriage at Newport on Tuesday next, I fear it will not be in my power, in the present state of the roads, to reach Halifax in time for the meeting on Wednesday. I will therefore trouble you to make this apology for my absence.

I am, etc.,

CHARLES PORTER.

J. W. Nutting, Esq., Secretary.

(2)

MY DEAR SIR,—Though Dr. Porter's note requires no answer, I should not be sorry that he knew my candid opinion that there is no individual in this Province whose marriage ceremony ought to have interfered with an appointed meeting of the Governors for the interest of the College of which Dr. P. himself is the head, and ought to be the most warmly interested friend.

I very sincerely regret that I can see no such feeling either in the President or Vice-President.

Yours very truly,

DALHOUSIE.

Gov. House, 6 Jan'y 1820.

Mr. Nutting.

We all know the type of Don represented by Dr. Porter; unfortunately his indolence, insolence, and (too often) ignorance have been long revered by Englishmen as qualities appropriate to the dignity of learning. It would be too much to say of Dr. Porter that he 'made a mistake' in treating Lord Dalhousie to a specimen of his abominable manners; for men of his type do not think of the institutions whose interests they are appointed to supervise; they think only of themselves, and the immediate result was that Lord Dalhousie gave up all idea of interesting himself in 'King's,' and (four months later) laid the corner-stone of 'Dalhousie' on the parade ground of Halifax.

Thus the lead in university matters passed away from King's, and it would seem as though the day for a sectarian university were gone for ever. Nevertheless, if King's desires to persist, it may take comfort from the contemplation of the stately and prosperous Baptist University of Wolfville, only twenty miles from Windsor, in which latter town King's is appropriately situated. To be the opposite of 'indolent, ignorant, and insolent'; to back their own men through life instead of neglecting and repulsing them; to take care that the heads of school and college are 'King's' men by training—these are the commonplace but efficacious measures by which 'King's' may slowly make a considerable position for itself. If it needs any more lessons in failure, it can study King's College and School, London.

The constitution of Dalhousie is a pure oligarchy; the constitution of U.N.B. is a nightmare. 'U.N.B.' is the popular contraction of 'University of New Brunswick,' situated at Fredericton, the capital of the province. The building is comely; it might be a French château, somewhat bare of external ornament. It stands on a hill in

a pretty park. The institution is Government-supported, and enjoys all the disadvantages of Government control without any of the advantages. It was once a Church foundation, but it has become non-sectarian, though it has to face the keen rivalry of the famous Methodist University of Sackville.

The best friends of Fredericton University will not quarrel with the statement that it is, at present, deplorably weak; the supporters of Sackville will probably admit that the rivalry of Sackville is the core of the question—how to improve the University of New Brunswick?

Since 'Fredericton' (to use an incorrect but more manageable title) is a Government University, the natural suggestion is, 'Increase the Government grant.' No doubt; but 'Government' is not a separate entity; the Methodist Connexion is strongly represented in the House, and it can, and does, effectually prevent further Government help being given to Fredericton unless it is given to Sackville at the same time. Even if it were not rather absurd for a Government to subsidise two universities in one province with half a million inhabitants, the burden would probably prove to be excessive for the taxpayer.

The attitude of Sackville is intelligible, if perhaps somewhat exacting. The founders of their University paid for it, and have since maintained it as a protest against the Church bias of Fredericton; they do not wish to see their foundation subside into an annexe of its rival. A question often asked, and never answered, is: 'When you have strangled Fredericton, what are you going to do next?' This point-blank inquiry is always evaded by the answer: 'We do not wish to strangle Fredericton.' If that is so, however, there is no sense in the present attitude of Sackville. Assuming, then, that Sackville succeeds (and it always has succeeded ~~hitherto~~), what next? Can Sackville become the leading university of New Brunswick? Hardly; its geographical position forbids. It is situated in the extreme south-east of the province, and is almost in Nova Scotia. It therefore draws with ease on the Methodist population of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, while, being actually in New Brunswick, it is ideally placed as a theological college for the Maritime Provinces. For the University of New Brunswick it could hardly be worse placed.

Moreover, Fredericton is a royal foundation, and the Government grant cannot be withdrawn, so that Sackville cannot destroy its rival; it can only attenuate him. Thus, if Fredericton wins in the long and strenuous race, the destiny of Sackville would seem to be that it should become a stronger and wealthier Wolfville (otherwise known as 'Acadia University'). This would be a very fine position, ensuring even a wider influence than that which it at present commands. It must be repeated that Fredericton is powerless to shake

off Government control ; but what it can do to popularise itself it has done ; it is not to-day distinctively a Church institution.

If we now examine the machinery of the University we shall hardly wonder that the ship makes no way. There is a 'Senate' which is not an academical body ; the 'Chancellor' is not the Head of the University, but shares his authority with the 'President of the Senate,' who is also Chief Superintendent of Education for the provinces, and, by a freak of fortune, an ex-President of Sackville. There is no Electorate, Court, or Council to represent popular control. There is one Faculty which grants two degrees, 'Arts' and 'Engineering,' but it has no direct control over the policy of the University. Over all the province hangs the impending shadow of McGill, whose prestige is already great enough to depress even exuberant spirits in the Maritime Provinces.

The University has eight professors and 132 students ; the number of the latter is on the increase. 'History' is an annexe of the 'Classics' ; the history of the British Empire being ignored for the excellent reason that there is no money to pay for a professor of that subject, and of several others. The only substitute for money is enthusiasm, which cannot be bought with money. Failing money, enthusiasm, and re-organisation, Fredericton will remain the Micawber of Canada.

WALTER FREWEN LORD.

Rivière du Loup :
31st August, 1906.

THE FRENCHWOMEN OF THE SALONS

WHY is it that the Frenchwomen of the salons of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were so celebrated? Because they were the most *superb* hostesses the world has ever known, and because they inspired men.

Now in what lay the supreme art of these queens of entertainers? They did not give music to their guests, not always dinner or supper, (some were too poor for this); most of them were neither young nor beautiful; they were not well or thoroughly educated as a rule, and some were by no means rich. One of them was blind. Yet, whether they were rich or poor, old or young, pretty or plain, well-educated or ill-educated, they were great social queens, whom it was a privilege to know, and the *entrée* to whose salons was regarded as the hall-mark of distinction and merit, where the guests were sure to be happy, cheered, soothed, stimulated and admired. The secret of the success of these great women, (for they *were* great in a small world), was that they possessed the supreme qualities of tact, charm, and sympathy—qualities of the soul which enabled them to draw out all that was best, finest, noblest in men. They appealed to the inner man and not merely to the senses. To do this in perfection required the most exquisite gifts of mind and heart. No fool could possibly do it. Beauty, riches, birth, rank, all admirable adjuncts it is true, were of no avail without the *spiritual force* which enabled these women to illuminate the spirit of their guests. In proportion as they possessed this spiritual force, their power and influence existed.

Shenstone says, 'There is a quality in which no woman in the world can compete with a Frenchwoman, it is the power of intellectual irritation. She will draw wit out of a fool.' If of a fool, then how much more of the really gifted! Now the women of the salons possessed this quality of intellectual irritation in a superlative degree. They never tried to show off their own cleverness, but always the cleverness of others. With this object in view, they led the conversation, putting in an adroit question or remark occasionally, but always with the idea of leading up to the special subject and displaying the

talents peculiar to each man present. The French have always excelled in conversation, but Madame de Staël said that no one who had not heard it *before* the Great Revolution of 1789 could know what conversation really was.

It was Madame de Rambouillet who originated the salon, and made it the power it was for 250 years. It was in her salon that the custom originated of authors (who until then were poor, and more or less miserable and despised) reading out their poems to the assembled guests. Such a thing had never been seen before, of literary men being received as equals by the great world, after being gently taught good manners, encouraged to stand upright, instead of humbly bending their backs; of boldly expressing their opinions, instead of speaking 'with bated breath and whispering humbleness,' thankful even for kicks, if they were allowed to pick up the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table. It was in this salon that the works of Corneille were first discussed and appreciated, although it must be confessed that the great man was a fearful bore in the salon, and read his own plays abominably. Fénelon was one of its chief ornaments. It was here too that Bossuet, at the age of seventeen, improvised a magnificent discourse one evening on a given subject that held the company spellbound to midnight. 'I have never heard anyone preach so *early* or so late,' said the witty Voiture.

Let us always honour Madame de Rambouillet for being the first of the Noblesse to admit into her magnificent hotel—which she designed herself, by-the-by—men, who for the first time enjoyed the sweets of consideration, gentleness, and peace. Voiture, Esprit, Malherbe, the Laureate of the salon, who always remained boorish, 'a toothless gallant, always spitting,' in spite of every polite influence, but who wrote excellent poetry; Marin, who wrote a poem of 45,000 verses called 'Adonis'; Chapelain, who wrote *La Pucelle*, and who was shabby and dirty to the last in spite of all the efforts of the Marquise to reform him, but who was an encyclopædia of knowledge and consulted by the savants of every country in Europe; Ménage, Conrart, the first perpetual secretary of the Académie Française; Godeau, the dashing little gallant; Colletet, the clever drunkard, besides the greater lights of Corneille, Fénelon, Bossuet, Balzac (*not* Honoré de), Richelieu, Condé, Pascal, Arnauld and La Rochefoucauld. Literary merit all must have, or they were not admitted. This was the distinguishing feature of the salon. Possessing this, Madame drew them all in, compelled the frivolous to consider serious things, and the pedants to remember they were men first and authors afterwards, and also that there is a light side of life as well as a solid one, that the gazelle has its uses as well as the elephant. For thirty years in her historic Salon Bleu she held her Court. She turned refinement into a fine art, and all of talent, wit or birth, who came in contact with her, were impressed by it. She had exquisitely refined tastes, and possessed

a Greek love of beauty in all its forms. She was adored as a model of courtesy, wisdom, knowledge and sweetness.

It was in Madame de Rambouillet's salon that the French language, as at present spoken, was first brought to completion and perfection. It had been corrupted by many ignoble modes of speech, and there was an excessive amount of Rabelaisian coarseness, which Madame de Rambouillet and her *précieuses* determined to put down. That this eventually led, after many years, to affectation, we know. But even this had its uses in inspiring Molière to write his wittily sarcastic comedies, *Les Précieuses Ridicules* and *Les Femmes Savantes*, which hold the stage even now, and have contributed to the gaiety of nations. The affectations passed away, the good results in purifying the most fascinating language in the world remain to this day.

As regards the purification of manners, this salon has been called 'the cradle of good manners in France,' and well it deserved the title. I cannot give instances of the worst cases of bad manners even amongst the great ones of the Court, but I will mention a few of the less gross cases, which are quite bad enough. The Comte de Brégis, at a dance, once received a slap from his partner, and retaliated by pulling her hair down in the middle of the banquet. At supper, at a big reception, the Marquis de la Case seized a leg of mutton from a dish and beat a lady on the head with it, and smeared her dress with gravy. The lady treated it as a huge joke.

At the Court of Louis the Thirteenth the people were sometimes admitted to have the inestimable privilege of seeing the King dine. One day a young woman stared at him too fixedly, he thought; so he took a mouthful of wine, and squirted it all over her bare throat and bosom. The *précieuses* compelled men to treat them with decency, and to respect their sex by selecting topics of conversation fit for the ears of civilised women. It was a mighty enterprise, and no one can measure the transformation they effected in manners without making a minute examination of the indecency of the day, which is not edifying reading, especially for the young, so I should advise it to be taken as read.

Even La Grande Mademoiselle, niece of Louis the Thirteenth, destined herself later on to hold a salon of no mean influence, heiress to vast wealth and estates, the heroine of the Fronde, who fired the cannon from the Bastille, and saved the great Condé from destruction, first learnt good manners at Madame de Rambouillet's, and was thankful for it. At first she was a regular dragoon in petticoats, and swore like a Cossack. She threatened to tear out the beard of the Maréchal de l'Hôpital with her own hands, and her ladies followed suit in roughness and brutality. La Grande Mademoiselle ended by adoring Madame de Rambouillet, and set the example in her own salon of good manners and refinement. It was she who first introduced the fashion of writing sketches of the characters of the people around

her, always so popular with the French, and so admirably treated by La Bruyère in his *Caractères* (now a classic), and in more modern times by that most accomplished writer and critic Sainte-Beuve. Madame de Vervins killed one of her servants by excessive beating, and the people of Paris sacked her palace for it.

I quote as an example of the bad manners of man to man the celebrated Duc d'Épernon, who, when discussing official affairs with the Archbishop of Bordeaux, hit him in the face with his fist, and gave him several cuts with his cane.

It was in Madame de Rambouillet's salon that the celebrated French Academy first saw the light. Richelieu issued letters patent entitling it to call itself 'The French Academy, because its express purpose was to preserve and improve the French language.' The French Academy still exercises the same protective influence on French language and literature.

To the salon of Mademoiselle de Scudéry, the authoress of many ten-volume novels, and who was a perfect encyclopædia of knowledge, I can only briefly allude, but at her celebrated *Samedis* (which we should now call her at-home days) the *grand monde* and the literary world thronged as they used to do at her great predecessor's. She was never good-looking, but was endowed with charm as well as talents. She refused many offers of marriage, and died at the age of ninety-four, with the reputation of never deserting a friend, and notably the great Condé's family after the reverses of the Fronde. Amongst her friends were Madame de Sablé, a celebrated *salonnière* herself; the Marquis de Montausier and his wife, who was the celebrated Julie d'Angennes, daughter of Madame de Rambouillet; La Rochefoucauld, Madame La Fayette, Madame de Sévigné, Madame Scarron, one day to be the wife of Louis the Fourteenth, known as Madame de Maintenon; the witty Madame Cornuel, who called the eight Generals appointed after the death of Turenne 'la petite monnaie pour Turenne,' and also said of our James the Second 'that the Holy Spirit had eaten up all his understanding,' and many more. The tenth Muse, as Mademoiselle de Scudéry was called, seems to have had a very happy, cheery nature, free from the pessimism which darkened the minds of so many of her sister salon-holders.

Of Madame de Sévigné, another salon-holder, Mademoiselle de Scudéry wrote: 'She inspires affection in all hearts that are capable of feeling it. Nobody else has ever better known the art of being graceful without affectation, witty without malice, modest without constraint, and virtuous without severity.' Madame de Sévigné's great passion was for her daughter, Madame de Grignan, a beautiful, odious creature, who was as much disliked as her mother was adored, and who left her mother to die of smallpox alone, for fear of catching the infection. It was to this daughter she wrote those thirty years

of incomparable letters, celebrated as the most delightful and *spirituelles* epistles even a Frenchwoman ever produced.

Space does not allow allusion to the host of minor salons that soon sprang up, interesting as these were. We must pass on rapidly to the great ones of the eighteenth century, and first of all to that of the Marquise Du Deffand. Not well educated, and married very young to a man 'with whom she had nothing in common,' she at first drifted into the dissolute set of the Regent, and was introduced to his 'petits soupers,' but she was too good for him, and soon wearied a mere sensualist. She seems early to have been disillusioned with society and life. Ennui followed her steps all her days. It was not until she was well over fifty that she opened her salon, which at once became a noted centre for the great ones of the earth. D'Alembert, Montesquieu, Pont de Veyle, Chevalier d'Aydie, Froment, La Harpe, Marmontel, Dorat, Saurin, Beaumarchais, Edward Gibbon, Fox, Burke, Horace Walpole, and many other men of letters frequented her salon. Yet she said later: 'I have seen many savants and men of letters; I have not found their society delightful.' Brilliant, fascinating, charming, restless, eager, sceptical, and saturated by the free-thinking spirit of her age, she seems all her life to have been as a ship without a rudder. She desired to be religious, as the state of the greatest happiness in the world, but with her sceptical nature it was impossible.

She was not the lifelong friend of Voltaire for nothing. She herself has been dubbed 'La femme Voltaire.' The President Hérault loved her all his life. All her unhappiness lay in the fact that she could not love, she could not forget herself, and could not believe her friends loved her, judging from the lack of love in her own heart. Although surrounded by adoring friends to extreme old age, she always doubted their love for her, and made herself wretched by her cold, dry, sceptical spirit. She loved with her head rather than her heart. She lacked what modern people call temperament, and others a harder name. She allowed her cold analytical spirit to spoil all her belief in goodness and disinterestedness. Yet she, who doubted the friendship of all her friends to herself, was ever a warm and devoted friend of others. It was her misfortune, not her fault, she could not love. In 1754 she became totally blind, and this was the direct cause of another future famous salon-holder coming on the scene, Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse. An illegitimate daughter of a great lady, whose half-brother and half-sister embittered her life, she was very glad to accept an offer from Madame Du Deffand to become her companion and reader. Madame Du Deffand warned her before she came to her, that she could not brook the smallest deceit or unstraightforward conduct. The two women lived together for ten years, at first with contentment, but afterwards with difficulty, which led to an open rupture. Madame Du Deffand was accustomed to turn night into day, and consequently kept her bedroom until six o'clock in the

evening; then she descended to her salon. One day, on coming down earlier than usual, she found Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse holding a salon of her own, which was frequented by the most celebrated men of Madame Du Deffand's set. Loud were her outcries of ingratitude and deceit, and not without reason. The two women parted for ever. The friends of Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse, who was almost entirely without means, ensured her a small pension, and then the celebrated salon in the Rue Belle Chasse was opened, and the triumphs of ten wonderful years began. Madame Du Deffand told her great friend D'Alembert, the chief ornament of her salon, he must choose between her and Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse, and he went over to the younger woman, whom he loved with passionate devotion, and whose premature death, ten years later, practically killed him.

In 1765, when Madame Du Deffand was sixty-eight years of age, she made the acquaintance of Horace Walpole, son of the English Prime Minister, and who strongly resembled herself in tastes and character, with one notable exception—that he was never bored, and was interested in everything around him. The warmest possible friendship sprang up between this accomplished man of the world and the famous Marquise, and on her side this friendship developed into passionate love. She loved him with the whole pent-up passion of a lifetime. Nature has curious ways of avenging herself for self-suppression or retarded development. Horace Walpole was under fifty years of age, and although as devoted in spirit as a man of his stamp could be to the blind, sad, but still brilliant woman, he was terribly afraid of being ridiculed for the love a woman over sixty bore him, but at the same time he never allowed this fear to make him brutal to her, to quench the friendship he felt for her, or his delighted appreciation of her society. The two had the very strongest mental affinity for each other, and it was a cruel stroke of fate not to allow them to meet earlier in life. Oh! the pity of it, that everything in life comes too late! Horace Walpole never married (he lived to the age of eighty), and there is no doubt no woman ever affected him or charmed him as much as the Marquise Du Deffand. Her letters to him, filling two thick volumes (of course dictated to her faithful secretary Wiant), are most interesting and wonderful reading, only surpassed in their turn by those of Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse to the Comte de Guibert. Courted to the last of her long life by the finest society in France, Europe and England, Madame Du Deffand was devoured to the last by ennui, and is a striking instance of the futility of charm and intelligence to give personal happiness, unless combined with religion, or a strong sense of duty to humanity.

Vous voulez [she wrote to Walpole] que j'espère vivre quatre-vingt-dix ans ! Ah ! Mon Dieu, quelle mauvaise espérance ! Ignorez-vous que je déteste la vie, que je me déteste d'avoir tant vécu et que je ne me console point d'être née ? Je ne suis point faite pour ce monde-ci ; je ne sais pas s'il y a un autre ; quel

qu'il puisse être, je le crains. Vous êtes en droit de me dire, 'Contentez-vous de vous ennuyer, abstenez-vous d'ennuyer les autres.'

Again :

Je suis bien fâchée d'être aussi ignorante, d'avoir été si mal élevée, de n'avoir aucun talent ou de n'être pas bête et manger du foin. Cette dernière manière serait peut-être la meilleure; je m'ennuyerais moins, je dormirais mieux, et je n'aurais pas de mauvaises digestions.

Again :

Mon Dieu ! Mon Dieu ! qu'il y a peu de gens supportables, mais de gens qui plaisent il n'y en a point. Je trouve tout le monde détestable.

And this was said by the most courted, the most flattered, and in spite of her faults, one of the most beloved women in a country where women have always been most beloved and have always had enormous influence.

The Marquise suffered from malady of the soul with its ennui, egoism, doubt and despair, and which made her life so dramatic, although it was entirely destitute of events. When her faithful secretary Wiart wept at her deathbed, she exclaimed, 'You love me, then !' She died as she had lived, doubting. To Walpole she confided her pet dog, which got fat, and died of old age, at his house at Strawberry Hill.

The malady of the soul of Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse rendered her life still more tragic and insupportable, and killed her prematurely at the age of forty-three. Her passionate love for the Comte de Guibert, following immediately on the top of her equally profound feeling for the Marquis de Mora (son of the Spanish Ambassador to France), and who adored her, combined with the morbid remorse she felt at loving another while her first lover was dying, burnt out her life. Her letters to the Comte de Guibert are the most extraordinary monument to passion existing in any language. The intensity, power, and feverish height of this terrible passion cannot be surpassed. Sainte-Beuve says that to-day 'Posterity classes the book in the series of immortal paintings and testimonies of passion, of which there is not so great a number that we cannot count them. Amongst those of Sappho, Phædra, Dido, Ariadne, Héloïse, Manon Lescaut, the letters of Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse are in the first rank.' As a trait peculiarly French, it may be mentioned that these immortal letters to Monsieur de Guibert were published after his death by his wife.

Mon ami [Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse wrote], in the days when people believed in witchcraft, I should have explained all that you have made me experience by saying that you had the power to throw a spell over me. I owe it to you that I have tasted that pleasure which intoxicates the soul to the point of taking from it all feelings of pain and sorrow.

The Comte de Guibert, who was also the first love of another celebrated woman, Madame de Staël, was a brilliant society man, of great charm, of showy, superficial gifts, of whom great things had been expected and predicted, but which never came to pass. The Marquis de Mora was infinitely his superior, and Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse knew it. Both men were more than ten years her junior. She wrote to Monsieur de Guibert constantly of De Mora

as the most tender, the most perfect, the most charming being who ever existed, who abandoned to me his soul, his thought, and all his existence. I still owe to him all that my heart can feel that is most consoling, most tender, regrets and tears. His prepossession, his passion for me raised me to his level. Mon Dieu ! how have I fallen ! how sunken I am ! but he never knew it.

And again :

You have charmed me and rent my soul alternately. Never did I find you more lovable, more worthy of being loved ; and never have I been so penetrated with deep and poignant and bitter sorrow at the memory of M. de Mora. Why do you rend me and comfort me at the same moment ? Why this fatal mixture of pleasure and pain, of balm and passion ?

All this acts with too much violence on a soul that passion and misfortune have overwrought ; all this is completing the destruction of a body exhausted by illness and want of sleep. It is by you, or by Death that I must be relieved, or cured for ever ; all the world, all Nature, can do nothing for me.

You think that there is no degree of passion beyond that I have shown you. I answer that you know not everything, and that there are no words to express the force of a passion which feeds itself on tears and remorse, and desires but two things—to love or to die. There is nothing of that in books, *mon ami*. I spent an evening with you that would seem exaggerated if read in the pages of Prévost, the man who has best known all that passion has of sweet and terrible.

Again, when she was dying :

I would, *mon ami*, that during the few days I have to live you should not pass a single one without remembering that you are loved to madness by the most unhappy of human beings. *Mon ami*, come and dine to-morrow with Madame Geoffrin. I have so little time to live that nothing you can do for me could have consequences in the future. Adieu ! I have company in my room. Ah ! how irksome it is to live in society when one has but one thought.

All the three years this passion was at this pitch of frenzy and delirium, it was unknown to the world around her ; even devoted D'Alembert, who loved her with the same passion she did De Guibert, and who resided in the same house (there were ten families in the house) with her, never suspected it. Every night she, the most celebrated woman in Paris, presided from 5 to 9 or 10 in her salon, where all that Paris had of the most illustrious invariably assembled. She was too poor to give her guests either dinner or supper, but she gave them that which was infinitely better, the very best social intercourse the world has ever known. Marmontel said :

Never was conversation more lively, more brilliant than at her house. The continued activity of her soul was communicated to our souls. The brains she

stirred at will were neither feeble nor frivolous; the Condillacs and Turgots were among them. D'Alembert was like a simple docile child beside her. Her talent for casting out a thought and giving it for discussion to men of that class, her own talent for discussing it with precision, sometimes with eloquence; her talent for bringing forward new ideas, and varying the topic, with the facility and ease of a fairy—who with one touch of her wand can change the scene of her enchantment—these talents were not those of an ordinary woman.

Grimm says the same of her :

that she knew how to unite the different styles of mind without appearing to make the slightest effort. No one knew better how to do the honours of her house. She put everyone in his place, and everyone was content with it. She had great knowledge of the world, and that species of politeness which is the most agreeable—I mean that which has the tone of personal interest.

Was she beautiful? No, she was never that, and Grimm said her face was never young, but she had the greatest charm a face can have—a most varied and expressive countenance.

Up to the last she held her salon. Outwardly the charming, great, though suffering hostess, inwardly her life was all drama—not that of the stage, but the inexhaustible one of pure personal emotion and sensation. No wonder such a strain killed her. Her last words in her last letter to De Guibert were 'Adieu, *mon ami*! If ever I returned to life, I would employ it in loving you—but now there is no time.' Her influence had been enormous. With the great D'Alembert, the chief of the Encyclopædists, and their perpetual secretary, one of the most celebrated men of the age, she could do as she pleased. She influenced the election of the Academicians, and helped to inspire the Encyclopædists in their efforts to reform society. But her chief interest to women especially lies in herself, in her birth, her unhappy life, above all her unhappy love. In reading her life one can truly reflect: 'Happy is the woman who has no history.'

Another great salon-holder, outwardly cold, calm, and austere, but inwardly full of the deepest and most passionate feeling, was Madame Necker, wife of the celebrated Minister of State and financier, and mother of the famous Madame de Staël. She was one of the few great salon-holders who had all the gifts of the gods, youth, beauty, education, wealth, position, religion, a devoted and faithful husband, an adoring child. Yet she was no happier than any of her celebrated predecessors, and seems to have inspired less love than any of them, and much more criticism. She was what Sainte-Beuve calls 'une fleur transplantée.' Strongly religious, (she was the daughter of a Swiss pastor), she was destined to be the hostess of free-thinkers and philosophers. Of austere life, and passionately devoted to her husband at a period when marital love was sneered at, she was surrounded by such brilliant profligates as the Abbé Galiani, Diderot, the incomparable *mauvais sujet*, founder of the French Encyclopædia, and the rest. Diderot, although always more at home with the

Bacchante than the Virgin, appreciated the purity of soul of Madame Necker, and criticised himself and his defects to her. Adoring her husband, she did not understand or fathom his nature, and passionately deplored this, and when he was more fully understood by their brilliant and vivacious daughter, who worshipped both her parents equally, she wore herself out with passionate regrets and doubts about her capacity for retaining affection, or as to the reality of the love they felt for her. There was a sombre jealousy, none the less real for being unacknowledged, of the affection of the brilliant being, her daughter, and her husband. Madame Necker wanted to be all in all to those she loved. The melancholy and morbidity of this too conscientious creature, who forced herself to do everything from a sense of duty, and not because she liked it, (she opened her salon for her husband's sake), were merely another development of that ennui which devoured the souls of so many in that voluptuous age—*l'ennui, fils du plaisir*—and which, when idealised as with Madame Necker, turned to melancholy, reverie, and extreme emotional sensibility. She and her husband were almost unique examples, in that age, of virtue and passion in marriage, true disciples of another great Swiss, Rousseau, who never ceased *talking* of passion and virtue although he was incapable of feeling one or of practising the other.

Madame Necker's devoted friend of twenty years' standing was Thomas, her greatest woman friend the exquisite little Duchesse de Lauzun, grand-daughter of the Maréchal de Luxembourg, in her day a fashionable *salonnière*. Another of her great friends was Madame D'Houdetot, the friend of Rousseau, also Madame Geoffrin, who scolded her for her excessive sensibility—always a mark of friendship with the old lady—and who, when she came to see her, brought her comfortable chair with her. It appears that one day little Germaine Necker beat Madame Geoffrin because she wanted to sit in the chair herself. Madame Geoffrin took no offence, but, the next time she came, brought some bonbons for the child, and a whip for the mother. Madame Du Deffand also came occasionally, but she did not care for people who were too virtuous. She said of Necker that he was 'distrainé et abstrait,' was lacking in the quality which brings out the *esprit* of those with whom he spoke, so that one felt *plus bête* with him than with anyone else, or with one's self. He was therefore exactly the opposite of these women who held the salons.

Madame Necker's salon was more joyous later on, when her daughter Germaine's brilliant genius and dominant personality enlivened it. Madame de Staël was the true daughter of the Neckers, both mentally and spiritually, as well as in the flesh. She was undoubtedly the greatest woman-genius the world ever produced, and the equal of the most intellectual men of her day. But I do not intend to dwell long on her to-day. She would require a whole paper to herself. She exerted an enormous influence by her ideas and

writings. She was the pioneer of modern history. She introduced Germany and Italy to Europe. She could do everything, and do it splendidly. But a salon-holder, in the accepted sense, she was not. She did not want to listen to others, she wished to talk herself. Her influence politically was so great that Napoleon banished her from France. She never ceased attacking his policy after he became Emperor, and Napoleon brooked no criticism. So her fierce and futile opposition brought her ten bitter years of exile from her adored Paris, when she either ate her heart out at Coppet, or wandered over the Continent or England, being everywhere received as a brilliant queen, putting all women in the shade and most men. She has inspired an enormous amount of writing, even more than she wrote, for she gave birth to more original ideas than any woman who ever lived. But her genius was too universal for her to confine it exclusively to a salon. As S. G. Tallentyre epigrammatically puts it, 'the other *salonnières* made their salons their world. It was only this one who attempted to make the world her salon.'

From Madame de Staël one passes at once to her friend Madame Récamier, her beautiful Juliette as she always called her, and whose beauty, grace, and charm she adored and was never tired of praising. Madame de Récamier was universally acknowledged to be the most beautiful woman of that day. She had small features, a beautiful vermilion mouth, a dazzling complexion, and soft fine skin. She was a complete contrast in every way to Madame de Staël, who was heavy in appearance and feature, although her eyes—the eyes of genius—were magnificent, and her bust and shoulders beyond criticism. At receptions, Madame de Récamier's presence always caused intense excitement. People stood upon chairs to look at her. One of Napoleon's brothers, Lucien, fell desperately in love with her, and even Napoleon tried to make love to her, but without success.

It was after the Restoration that Madame Récamier held her salon, and was visited in her modest abode at the Abbaye aux Bois, (for Monsieur Récamier had lost all his fortune), by all the most noted men and women in Europe. Was it for her beauty she was so beloved? Scarcely that alone. Madame de Sévigné's daughter was very beautiful, but was universally detested. It was not for her intellect, for no one called her clever. It was not for her money, for she had none. It was for her gentle and tender sympathy, which radiated from her involuntarily as light from the sun; it was her soft charm, and the soothing influence she exercised upon men of genius, even the most irritable. Her charm was like the fragrance of a flower, involuntary, invisible, all-powerful, and all-extending. She was incapable of passion, unlike Madame de Staël, who was all fire and passion. Otherwise, she could never have exercised the tranquil, soothing influence she did—notably on the celebrated Chateaubriand, who visited her daily, and at whose deathbed she wept so much that her

eyes became permanently affected. People went to see her because they felt happy with her. No wife ever became jealous of her. Madame de Chateaubriand used to beg her to use her influence, and take charge of the happiness of her husband, a spoilt child of genius.

Prince Augustus of Prussia loved her for thirty years, and passionately desired the dissolution of her nominal marriage to M. Récamier and union with himself. But she had not sufficient character to make such a change in her life, and leave Paris. Prince Augustus travelled hundreds of miles to meet her on one occasion, but she did not keep the tryst. Although pierced to the heart by such indifference, he never upbraided her. 'The ring you gave me will go with me to my grave,' he wrote to her. He married, but he never forgot her. At his death her portrait was returned to her. She did not and could not reciprocate passionate love. She could only inspire it, and perhaps this was intended to be her *métier*. To inspire pure and unselfish love in men who were neither pure nor unselfish; to raise their morale by bringing out the poetry of their natures, rather than the sensual; to inspire them with an appreciation of the refined and beautiful in woman, without any hope of possession; to arouse their chivalry for weakness, must have had an elevating influence on the libertines of the day who had merely regarded women as an object of pleasure or desire, but now realised something of the influence and beauty of that which is always unattainable—namely, the ideal.

Madame Necker, Madame de Staël, and Madame Récamier follow each other in direct connection, but I must go back a few years and speak, last but not least, of one more salon-holder, and truly the most wonderful of them all, namely Madame Geoffrin. It is almost impossible to understand her influence. It is a mystery and therefore has all the interest which attaches to the mysterious. A *bourgeoise* of the *bourgeois* (her father had been a *valet de chambre*), married to a rich middle-class man, yet she reigned as a social queen before the Revolution, in one of the most aristocratic and exclusive societies the world has ever known. She was not received at Court, she was not young, or beautiful, or well educated. She could never spell properly, but had been taught to read, and to read much, by her clever old grandmother, who brought her up, but who otherwise refused to allow her to be educated, saying that she herself had done very well without education, and she considered if her grand-daughter were clever she could do without it too, and if stupid, education would only make her conspicuous. Her judgment proved correct, for Madame Geoffrin did uncommonly well without education. She had great knowledge of and penetration into character, and a tact that amounted to genius. Above all, she began life with a definite aim, namely a persistent determination to establish her salon. It was not merely a wish, but an *intention* to do it, and she had sufficient strength of character to carry it through. It is said that the gifted

but ever infamous Madame de Tencin (the reputed mother of D'Alembert, whom she left as a baby on the steps of a church) gave her lessons in the art 'de tenir salon.' She was gifted with the very finest social sense, and a dominant passion for consideration. Horace Walpole said she had more common sense than any woman he had ever met. She was very generous. She helped everyone; she paid Poniatowski's debts, helped Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse, Morellet, Thomas, and other writers magnificently. She delighted in giving costly presents to friends, and made up little bags of money for the poor on Sundays. She avoided all passions and controversies, and disliked unhappy people about her. She would not be overshadowed by gloomy people.

Her salon was one of the institutions of the eighteenth century. Princes, ambassadors, artists, savants, philosophers, men of letters, beautiful women thronged her rooms. She gave a dinner once a week to artists like Boucher, Vanloo, Vernet, and also another dinner weekly to literary men such as Marmontel, Holbach, D'Alembert, Gibbon, Hume, Walpole. To these dinners only one woman was admitted, Mademoiselle de l'Espinasse. What art she displayed in selecting her, the one woman of all, who knew how to make men talk their best, and who, like herself, knew how to listen! Beautiful girls and women confided in her. Stanislas Poniatowski, who afterwards became King of Poland, she called her son. 'Mamma, your son is king,' he wrote to her from Poland. 'Come and see him.' She went, and her whole journey was like a royal procession. Extraordinary honours were paid to her. Maria Theresa received her at Schönbrunn. Princes made her fine speeches, and in Poland its King honoured her as a dutiful son—a French son—does a beloved mother. She received the crowning triumph of her wonderful life.

This tour finished [she wrote to D'Alembert], I feel I shall have seen enough of men and things to be convinced that they are everywhere about the same. I have my storehouse of reflections and comparisons well furnished for the rest of my life. All that I have seen makes me thank God for being born French and a private person.

This was all her history. Apart from her salon she had none—no lovers, no vices, no past, no adventures. That this little 'private person' should have had the influence she did, and have held the most wonderful salon of all since Madame de Rambouillet, at a time when to be *bourgeois* was to be *capaille* to the aristocrats of that day, and to be virtuous was to be hopelessly unfashionable, is indeed one of the most extraordinary phenomena of those phenomenal times. To understand the brilliant Frenchmen who surrounded her, to play upon them as on an instrument of music, to inspire all with confidence in her motherly sympathy and interest, and to weld her circle together and to maintain it in harmony, required the very greatest social genius, combined with the warm heart of the Frenchwoman. No unkind action is mentioned of her. Even her last

recorded utterance is delightful in its thoughtfulness. When her friends in her bedroom during her last illness were discussing schemes for the improvement of the masses, she raised herself to say—‘*Ajoutez-y le soin de procurer les plaisirs.*’

And with this charming sentiment of a happy nature, who wishes to see others happy, let us leave her.

M. DALE.

THE NOVEL AS A POLITICAL FORCE

THE people of the United States have suffered this year from one of those shocks to their moral and social system which at regular intervals disturb their self-satisfaction, and lead them to halt for a little from 'the Sabbathless pursuit of wealth.' Their conscience appears to work in jerks: for years it allows them without a murmur to countenance corruption in every department of civil life, and abuses in commercial and economic relations which would be tolerated in no other country; when suddenly a speech is made, a book is written, or a disaster occurs, and there is at once an immense revulsion of feeling. A fierce outcry is raised against the tyranny of Tammany Hall or the unscrupulousness of Trusts, and a feverish attempt is made to put their house in order. Such has been the effect recently produced by a novel, *The Jungle*, which, written by an almost unknown author, has roused the conscience of the whole nation. It seems to feel as one man that it is

Embedded in a world of greed
Of mammon-quakings dire as earth's.

Much had been written in newspapers and reviews about the condition of the packing-houses in Chicago, but until this book appeared it was all quietly disregarded. Where journalism had failed, journalism mixed with fiction succeeded. Mr. Upton Sinclair has disfigured his book as a work of art by the introduction of big patches of impressionist description which are in no sort of connection with his story. It may be questioned whether the ugliness and squalor of his theme, and the utter brutality of the detail with which he has tricked it out, leave any scope for artistic treatment, but in any case the pages of digression, in which we leave the story for sickening accounts of what purports to be the actual condition of industrial life at Chicago, are out of place in a novel. They are newspaper articles awkwardly foisted into the framework of fiction. Together with the functions, Mr. Sinclair has taken over some of the vices of a journalist; yet he might plead that the end justified the means, and that the American public could not be awakened to the evil around them without this crude and sensational presentation. Fed on sensation by its Press, it has become a slave to it.

If *The Jungle* is not remarkable as a work of literature, except for its crude horror and pitiless realism, its success as a piece of propaganda has been striking. An American critic has suggested that the pictures of Lithuanian peasants, sacrificed to the political and commercial corruption of Chicago, do not quite live, because they are used 'to point a moral and adorn a tale'; but at least they were vivid enough to arouse a nation, and their effect is comparable to that produced on the slavery question half a century ago by *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

Here again it was a novel which was needed to reveal to the American people the canker at their heart. Their newspapers, which day by day pour out a stream of vulgar sensationalism, cry 'Wolf!' so incessantly that they are not believed when they chance to tell the truth. Moreover, they are almost entirely in the power of the capitalist class, and cannot therefore play an honest or healthy part in one of the great questions of American politics, the relation of capital and labour. Their functions as critics of public life are left to the other great popular form of literature, the prose story of real life, which moves public opinion by vivid pictures of events that are, in fact, taking place before the eyes of all, but which the narrowness of vision of the individual does not allow him to see. The novel indeed in America, and in England, is not merely the most important form of literature; it is also a political power of incalculable force, being one of the main factors in the formation of that opinion which in democratic countries is the real sovereign.

In England politics and religion are the two absorbing fields of discussion, and the novel which deals intimately with the real life of the people was bound in this country to concern itself with political ideas. Its 'large and liberal form' makes it easy to set around the basis of the love story the reflections of the essay and the theories of the pamphlet, so that it becomes not only an impression but also a criticism of life. It is a slender line which separates criticism from reforming activity, and the ardent novelist full of a social cause or a political ideal can by his art give them a personal and imaginative setting, and arouse in their support the emotions of his readers. Again, the average Englishman prefers his books of amusement to possess a moral or a political thesis. It suits his practical bent to combine some lesson or instruction with entertainment, to swallow the doctrinal pill when coated with the sugary covering of fiction; or, to put it in another way, to partake of the wholesome food of edification with the sparkling draught of romance. Add to this his dislike of abstract theory and his suspicion of a book which advocates a cause in a theoretical or a scientific way, and we can recognise how strong is the inducement for a writer who wishes to influence his generation to insert his teaching or his appeal in a story of real life.

The English novel has inherited this social function from its

first masters. When it arose, in the middle of the eighteenth century, it was not a mere love story: it claimed to be and it was accepted as a means of edification, for in those days prose literature which was not purely didactic required at least a serious purpose to justify it: In poetry alone could an author give free play to his fancy.

Samuel Richardson, the founder of the modern novel, always wrote under a sense of moral responsibility: destined originally for the Church, he consciously tried in his tales to supplement the work of the clergy, whom he considered remiss in their duties. His greater contemporary, Fielding, though he had nothing but contempt for the use of the novel as a vehicle of utilitarian morality and Church doctrines, was himself deeply interested in politics, and as a Bow Street magistrate he had come to learn some of the abuses which attended the administration of justice. While establishing the novel as 'the prose epic of humanity,' he realised its value as a political force, and showed that it could be made to express vividly the social and political abuses of the time. In the preface to *Amelia* he describes it as a book 'designed to promote the cause of virtue,' (a standing trait common to all novels of the period), 'and to expose some of the most glaring evils which at present infest the country.' The political conditions of the time made any sweeping reforms impossible, but from Fielding's day the novel has been the exponent of humanity, pointing out by example the injustices and narrowness of existing institutions, and leading on public opinion to a new order.

For a time, indeed, it seemed that the didactic would overpower the artistic side, and that the novel would not establish its place as a form of fine literature at all, but would be reduced to the position of a political drudge. In the hands of the lesser contemporaries of Fielding, who show the didactic and practical tendencies of the times in exaggerated forms, it became a mere variety of journalism, a pamphlet on some temporary abuse, an attack on a government or an individual. And when the French Revolution came to stir the hearts and minds of all humanity, it was the novel which in England was the most popular vehicle for wild speculation on politics, religion, marriage, and education. The love story became a covering for the social treatise, a machine but thinly veiled for promulgating theories of government, conduct, and society. The speculations of Hobbes and Locke, of Rousseau and Condorcet were developed, distorted and emotionalised in crude works of fiction, written to arouse the feelings of people who had not the capacity or desire to make a study of political science, but who could be worked upon by imaginative literature to accept and agitate for ideas that they only half comprehended.

From this degradation the novel was raised to a higher place as an artistic form than it had yet enjoyed by the genius of Walter Scott and of Jane Austen, who introduced into it two powerful motives:

romance, and the light comedy of manners. Prose fiction received a new artistic dignity at a period when the changing conditions of public life gave it an immense increase of political influence. From the beginning of the nineteenth century the middle classes gradually rise to the sovereign power, while Parliament becomes more and more submissive to public opinion. Together with the growing importance of the democracy in practical politics came the growing importance of the democratic form of literature in spreading abroad political ideas. And the novel is essentially the democratic form of literature. Drama and poetry have always been for the educated minority; the single form of literary art which the masses habitually read is prose fiction. On the other hand, they do not read for the most part serious studies on politics and sociology; and they are not willing to go through intellectual toil in order to form their political views. Like Charles Lamb they put scientific treatises and Blue-books in the class of 'Biblia abiblia'—books that are no books. The novel is at once their light and their serious literature. It can instruct while it amuses, and inculcate ideas while it tells a story.

Hence side by side with the newspaper, which expresses the more transient feelings, the novel has in the nineteenth century played the part of the Fourth Estate of the Realm, preparing, and then following, every great change of feeling, and reflecting every big political movement. It is possible then to read the inner history of the age in the pages of its novelists, for their function has been not only to provide amusement, but to formulate the feelings of the people; to show where hard laws oppressed, and how they could be modified; to spread a knowledge of their fellow-men to all classes, and to foster sympathy between them.

During the Victorian era the novel reached the meridian of its power in the hands of a brilliant group of writers. It was a time of great backgrounds, great causes, and great awakenings, when hopes ran high and the reforming spirit swept over England. In the bringing about of reform the novel took a prominent place. Some writers set themselves to attack specific abuses, others to change the whole political attitude of the nation. Charles Reade, using the combined arts of journalist and novelist, inveighed against the conditions of prisons and private lunatic asylums, and the tyranny of trade unions, in novels which are to-day 'like exploded shells buried under the ruins they have created.' It was the pen of another novelist that more than anything else led to the abolition of debtors' prisons and the worst evils of the parochial and private school systems, and brought about the reform of legal procedure. But these were not the greatest services of Charles Dickens to his country; rather it was the spirit of humaneness and of love for their fellow-men with which he penetrated the whole mass of society, justifying the words of Lord Herschell

about him, that he was 'one of the best public servants the country ever had.' For thirty years he was a 'professor of humanitarianism in fiction,' and in the great reaction against the policy of *laissez-faire* which arose in his generation and has continued into ours, he led the way for social legislation and social reconstruction. The novel of Dickens is a true democratic force, a literature of the people, for the people, by the people. Their sorrows and their hopes, their miseries and their injustices, were described by one of their own class. As Mr. Chesterton has said, Dickens wanted what the people wanted, and hence his writings became household books. Much can rightly be said about his mawkish sentiment, his unreal pathos, his fantastic exaggeration, and his vulgar caricature, but withal Dickens remains the greatest popular power in Victorian literature, and his influence over the political opinions of his own and succeeding generations was and is immeasurable.

It was in great part the remarkable effect of Dickens's novels in asserting a common humanity which led Charles Kingsley to adopt the same form of literature in order to spread the kindred social ideas which he had at heart. While the emotions of the great Chartist meeting of April, 1848, were still boiling within him, he wrote *Yeast*, and nearly all his other novels were called out by some political crisis. Chartism, as a popular agitation, died on Kennington Common; Chartism, as a social influence, endured and found powerful and varying expression in the novels of four great writers of the age. Kingsley treated it as a Christian socialist, Disraeli as an imaginative politician, Mrs. Gaskell as a Christian woman, George Eliot, writing twenty years later, when reflection had taken the place of passion, as a social philosopher.

The propagation and the modification of the ideas of the Chartists in these books afford a striking illustration of the political force of novels. Chartism, which was in effect the first seed of Socialism in England, was a movement that sprang from the people, and could be influenced only by a form of literature which appealed to the people. For several years before Charles Kingsley wrote, Frederick Denison Maurice had perceived that the democratic movement in its essence was just and necessary, and had been striving to make it Christian. 'The new element,' he wrote in 1846, 'is democracy, in Church and State. Waiving the question of its evil or its good, we cannot stop it: let us Christianise it instead.' To this end he wrote tracts, held meetings, and founded societies and working men's associations. But with all his earnestness and effort he failed to reach the masses of the people, and the agitation went on its violent course in spite of his appeal. Carlyle, who was writing at the same time pamphlets of unequalled eloquence about the same ideas, failed also to bring home to the middle and the upper classes the rottenness of the social structure, and the need for human kindness in

economic relations. His style surely was imaginative enough, but because he wrote essays he was regarded, or disregarded, as a theorist!

Charles Kingsley was a man of much less intellectual force than Carlyle, and much less spiritual force than Maurice: 'yet he was able to make their ideas living influences because he could touch the heart of the people in imaginative literature, which thousands read, while his masters wrote profounder books that only came into the hands of few. He lived to see the ideas for which he had pleaded so passionately, and which had aroused such a storm in the 'Forties,' tranquilly adopted in the latter half of the century. The revolutionary ideals of 1848 became the liberal ideas of the next generation; and the development of opinion was in no small measure due to writers who could appeal to all classes in the country, and arouse in their readers sympathetic emotions. It is for the politician to design the actual schemes of reform, while it is for the novelist to set in motion among the people those currents of feeling which determine in the first place their political ideas, and finally the policy of the country. George Eliot, writing of her own work, pointed out this as the true function of the novelist with a purpose:—'The rousing of the nobler emotions that make mankind desire the social right, not the prescribing of special measures, concerning which the artistic mind, however strongly moved by social sympathy, is not the best judge.'

We have thus far seen how, in the Victorian era, the novel exercised a profound influence in spreading abroad more liberal, more humane, and more democratic ideas. But when we speak of the political novel in England, we at once think of Disraeli. He was the creator and the one great exponent of a new kind of fiction, for he was the first to conceive the possibility of using the novel for Parliamentary politics, and turning it into a party engine. This he did by placing his scenes in political society, and making his stories illustrate the political history of his time. Disraeli applied the method of Sir Walter Scott to his own times, taking good care to interpret events in such a way as to further the interests of his party—and himself. We may doubt whether he had in his early years a deep enthusiasm for the cause of the people: he was anxious above all to advance his own position, and after a little sad experience in the House of Commons he saw that he must win the first steps by literature.

Why, then, the world's mine oyster,
Which I with sword will open!

are the lines prefixed to *Vivian Grey*; if we substitute 'pen' for 'sword' we have the true intention of Disraeli. In *Coningsby* he declared that the printing-press is the chief political element of democracy, 'absorbing in great degree the duties of the Sovereign, the Priest,

and Parliament; it controls, it educates, it discusses.' Accordingly he determined to propagate his political and social ideas in literature and in that form of it 'which in the temper of his times offered the best chance of influencing opinion.' *Coningsby* would be more effective than a hundred speeches, for it was a political manifesto issued far beyond the confines of his constituency, to the whole nation. If the House would not listen to him, Disraeli would appeal from Parliament to the country. He sowed his seed in fiction, and he reaped the harvest as a Minister. The ideas of the 'Young England' party, which had hitherto been the property of a small group, became a popular force when set out in *Coningsby* and *Sybil*, while in *Tancred* the man who was to make Victoria 'Empress of India,' and to startle Europe by the purchase of the Khedive's shares in the Suez Canal, prophesied his own coming and brought it nearer. In the fragment of his unfinished novel which was published in the *Times* last year, there appears a sentence which may be taken as a piece of self-revelation: 'If anything is to be really done in this world it must be done by visionaries, by men who see the future, and make the future because they see it.' These words are an epitome of Lord Beaconsfield's life. He introduced the novelist's imagination into his statesmanship, and the statesman's foresight into his novels, and he attained complete success in either sphere because he could make the future live for himself and for others. He is thus an unique figure in the political and literary history of England, our only example of the novelist-statesman and the statesman-novelist.

In his own day and since his time several writers have attempted to continue the genus of fiction which he created. But statesmen, or even politicians, who are novelists are rare, and he has had no true successor. Popular authors like Trollope in the last generation, or Mrs. Humphry Ward and Mr. Spender in ours, have known how to catch some of the local colour of Parliamentary life and to produce entertaining accounts of political events, but they have not been able to design policies which would affect the opinions of their readers: they have added to the stock characters of fiction the gentle silver-haired prime minister, the energetic enthusiastic secretary, the shouting violent demagogue, but their books do not aspire to have, and certainly do not exert, a powerful force upon political ideas. Nor again is this influence to be found in the reflective and philosophical studies of Victorian politics which George Meredith has given in some of his novels. *Beauchamp's Career* is indeed definitely a political romance, but it is so in a very different sense from *Coningsby* or *Tancred*. It contains the sage reflection after the event, rather than the keen vision into the future; but it has a political lesson, if not a political purpose, for it demonstrates by an imaginative presentation the difficulty of reconciling the zeal of the reforming temper with the conservative instincts of society. In other works

Meredith has pleaded incidentally for political and social reforms, but partly by his excellences, partly by the waywardness of his style, he is not a writer who appeals to a large class, and he cannot be considered to affect general opinion to any extent. The political novel, as distinct from the novel of political colour, did not survive its creator. But the social novel was a continuous force in Victorian literature, and beyond specific evils which it attacked and removed we can trace in the broad movement from Individualism to Socialism, and the growing power of public sentiment—which are the broad features of our political history in the last fifty years—the influence in moulding opinion of a form of writing which was continually appealing to the emotions on behalf of the down-trodden or helpless classes.

Though prose-fiction has become more and more the predominant kind of literature, it appears to-day to exercise a less powerful influence on political movements than it did in the last century, but this impression is somewhat illusory. It is true that we have not to-day any giants of fiction comparable with the great names of the Victorian era, and we have no writers who paint humanity so truthfully, or who can influence their generation so deeply as Dickens, Kingsley, or George Eliot. Still there are not a few novelists who reveal the inner history of our time and interpret broad movements of which the nation as a whole is half unconscious. The spirit of the age is different; we have become scientific, and we no longer look for legislative panaceas or radical changes in human nature, but we analyse development, and trace the evolution of change. The scientific spirit has invaded the realms of fiction and has turned the novel of purpose into the novel of problem, the social novel into an imaginative study in sociology.

Foremost among the writers who have investigated in fiction the deeper movements which underlie modern politics is George Gissing; he devoted nearly all his life to studying and describing in vivid pictures 'that germinating nether-world which is gradually creating the labour movement.' In a series of books he exhibits *Demos* as it really is, with its virtues and its aspirations faithfully represented, its faults and its passions undisguised, while he more particularly depicts in action the development of Socialist agitation and notes its effects on various minds. It is in this direction that the novel of our time will have its chief function as a political force. The predominant trend of English politics is towards Socialistic measures, and the growing power in the country, as was seen in the last general election, is that of the industrial classes. What Thackeray once called the lazy, novel-reading, unscientific public will not study the problems of this new development in theoretical treatises or learned works of sociology; even if it did so, it would hardly be able to visualise the conditions and the problems there set out, and make them bear

a real meaning. It is exactly this which the novelist can do for 'the man in the street'; he can turn theories into people and problems into events, and by so doing bring them home to thousands who would otherwise remain ignorant or unsympathetic. The great novelist is the intermediary between different classes: by arousing sympathy for the creatures of his imagination he gains it also for ideas and ideals which his readers had hitherto not known or not understood. His power can be illustrated by an event like the Sweated Industries Exhibition recently held in London. Books and pamphlets and articles innumerable have been written about this economic evil; but they have failed to produce any active protest, because they cannot make vivid the conditions they describe, or call up a moving picture of misery. The exhibition was intended to effect this by showing the women and children engaged on their sweated tasks and the actual products of their labour. Even this has not the same force as a stirring novel, because it cannot equally select from experience and idealise it. The fiction is too obvious and undramatic: it is realistic but unreal. The spectators, too, do not feel the same emotion for the actual toilers on whom they gaze for an hour as for the imaginative characters of the novelist, who lays bare in all its pathos and sadness the wretched lives of the helpless victims and the cruelty of the system which crushes them.

The effect of *The Jungle* has shown that a novelist can still open the eyes of a people to a gross abuse which is being perpetrated in their midst, and rouse the conscience of the people against the tyranny of a selfish plutocracy. In an age when newspapers are falling more and more into the hands of a few capitalists, the writers of fiction may be frequently called upon to stir up feeling against particular evils, such as the scandalous practices of a Trust; but where there is a free and honest Press this is more properly its function. The passing events and questions of public life are for the journalist; the larger movements which underlie them for the novelist. Nor is his function merely to spread abroad and win sympathy for the ideas which are at work in society. Through the creations of his mind he can modify them; he can test them by the touchstone of life before they have been tried by experience. Especially when there is a tendency to abstract theory, as in the case of modern Socialism, he can exercise a profound influence by showing at work, in an imaginative picture of human nature, those feelings and passions which the theorist has neglected. Disraeli has said somewhere that the English gentleman's habit of discussing politics for half an hour after dinner has preserved this country from revolutions; to-day, when political power has shifted to another class, we require another safeguard against the crude programmes of demagogues, and this we may find in the treatment of political and social ideas by the masters of creative literature, who, appealing to different classes, can

correct extreme views. It has been in the past, and it will be in the future, one of the chief functions of our great novelists on the one hand to disclose in their creations the inner meaning of social conditions and to humanise the theories of radical reformers, and on the other to hasten progress by forecasting its next step and moulding towards it the minds of their generation.

NORMAN BENTWICH.

THE TRUE DARWINISM

PROFESSOR VON HARTMANN is reported to have said :

In the first decade of the twentieth century it has become apparent that the days of Darwinism are numbered : . . . among its latest opponents are such *savants* as Eimer, Gustav Wolf, De Vries, Hoocke, Von Wellstein, Fleischmann, Reinske, and many others.¹ Similarly, Professor Fleischmann maintains that the Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of Nature, that it is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of the imagination.²

If this be so, it will not be out of place to reconsider our position with regard to evolution, *i.e.* the origin of species, for 'Darwinism' was Darwin's theory to account for it.

In three years' time half a century will have passed since Darwin's work, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, was published in 1859. Up to the present day it is an indisputable fact that not a single variety or species of any wild animal or plant has ever been *proved* to have had its origin by means of natural selection.

It will be desirable to refer to Darwin's original paper³ and try to find wherein the failure lies. Darwin begins by emphasising the very obvious fact of the struggle for existence in Nature, with the survival of the few and the destruction of the many. He says 'it is the doctrine of Malthus applied in most cases with tenfold force.' The struggle is due to the enormous annual birth-rate, yet the average only is maintained. Why does the majority die ?

Turning to Malthus' *Essay on Population*,⁴ we find that the ultimate check to population is want of food ; that while man increases in a geometrical ratio, the food supply, in a limited country, cannot increase beyond an arithmetical ratio. Consequently, a time must come when some must die of starvation as well as by the immediate checks, as diseases, customs, as well as 'all those causes . . . whether of a moral or physical nature, which tend prematurely to weaken and destroy the human frame.'

¹ *The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer*, by J. Gerard, p. 281.

² *Die Darwinsche Theorie* ; see, e.g., pp. 339 and 346.

³ *On the Variation of Organic Beings*, &c., Journ. Lin. Soc. (read the 1st of July, 1858).

⁴ Seventh edition, p. 7.

Of course Malthus was not concerned with any question about the origin of species. Applying it to Nature, Darwin observes that the destruction 'mainly falls on seeds, eggs and the young'; that is to say, *long before any important varietal or specific characters have appeared* in the offspring. How, then, do new varieties and species arise?

It is here essential that the reader should clearly understand what a species really is. If he will open, *e.g.* Hooker's *Student's Flora of the British Isles*, at any page, and read the descriptions of any two species of the same genus, he will at once discover that a species is known by a collection of *constant* morphological characters, *i.e.* points of *structure* taken from any or all parts of the plant.

Two things must herein be emphatically insisted upon, *viz.* *sufficient differences in structure* between the species, and their *hereditary constancy*. If they be not thus *constant*, the descriptions cannot be depended upon, and the 'Flora' would be untrustworthy. Species are then, at least *relatively*, fixed entities. I say 'relatively,' because variability, or the capacity for varying, is presumed to exist in every organism; though as long as the conditions of life are unchanged for any number of generations, no variations may be expected. But, Darwin says:

Let the external conditions of a country alter . . . such changes of external conditions would, from acting on the reproductive system [he might have added vegetative system of plants also] probably cause the organisation of those beings which were most affected to become, as under domestication, plastic. Now, can it be doubted, from the struggle each individual has to obtain subsistence, that any *minute variation in structure* [my italics], habits, or instincts, adapting that individual better to the new conditions, would tell upon its vigour and health? In the struggle it would have a better *chance* of surviving; and those of its offspring which inherited the variation, be it ever so slight, would also have a better *chance*.

I have italicised one phrase, for the reader must bear in mind that *structure* is the *only* feature which systematists are concerned with in framing the diagnoses or descriptions of species.

The question here raised in the sentence 'Can it be doubted, &c.' can be answered in the negative categorically: *for any minute variations in structure*, such as are called 'individual differences,' have no effect whatever upon the 'health' or 'survival' of an organism, exclusive of any accidentally semi-starved condition,⁶ which cannot be called a 'variation,' unless persistent. Darwin practically founded his theory upon that question. He, in fact, did base it upon 'individual differences';⁷ these consist of 'minute variations of structure,' and are, as a general rule, quite independent of any question as to

⁵ *On the Variation of Organic Beings, &c.*, Journ. Lin. Soc. (1858).

⁶ Even this may become hereditary, as in many 'degraded' plants, if the conditions of life are constant.

⁷ *Origin, &c.*, sixth edition, p. 84.

the origin of species. Wallace distinctly repudiates such as being 'specific.' He says :

In securing the development of new forms in adaptation to the new environment, natural selection is supreme. Hence arises the real distinction . . . between specific and non-specific or developmental characters. . . . The latter are due to the laws which determine the growth and development of the organism, and therefore rarely coincide exactly with the limits of a species."

Yet it is upon 'individual differences' that all Darwinians rely for supplying the materials for selection. Systematic botanists can see them as well as theorists, but pay no attention to them, unless they can be proved to be *constant* by heredity.

Darwin then adds, 'Let the work of selection on the one hand and death on the other go on for a thousand years' (elsewhere he says 'millions upon millions') 'who will pretend to affirm that it would produce no effect, &c.?' We need only wait a season for the change to begin.

But 'individual differences,' I repeat, are, as a rule, quite inconstant; what security, therefore, is there that they will last for thousands of years? The unbiassed reader will at once see that the whole argument, as Fleischmann says, is purely hypothetical.

In the *Origin of Species*, &c., Darwin adds the following: 'On the other hand, we may feel sure that any variation in the least degree injurious would be rigidly destroyed. This preservation of favourable variations and the rejection of injurious ones, I call natural selection.'⁹

By 'favourable' he means 'adaptive'; and by 'injurious,' 'inadaptive' variations. This is shown by his illustration of 'a noble and commodious edifice' mentioned below. As a matter of fact no 'injurious' variations ever arise. 'Only a few of those annually born can live to propagate their kind. What a trifling difference must often determine what shall survive and which perish!'

The latter sentence is a pure assumption; for nothing in nature is known to justify it, in its application to the *Origin of Species*. In the mere struggle for existence among a batch of seedlings, it is the first to start in the race, and the better nourished seeds which get an advantage over others, overshadowing them and starving them, that brings about the survival of some and death of others; just as these survivors themselves would have succumbed, if still more vigorous individuals happened to have been there. This is what Darwin calls 'fortuitous destruction,' or ill-luck as we might say.¹⁰ That is in accordance with Malthus' theory; but it has nothing to do with *new* and *adaptive variations in points of structure* upon which a *new variety* solely depends. Darwin's fundamental mistake is thus seen to be his adding minute variations of *structure* to Malthus' causes of the maintenance of life or death. Plants in specific or varietal

⁹ *Fortnightly Review*, March 1895, p. 444.

¹⁰ *Origin*, &c., p. 63 (Sixth edition)!

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

characters often depend upon the flowers and fruits; but these are non-existent when the struggle chiefly takes place, and could in no way, therefore, insure the 'survival of the fittest' among any batch of seedlings among which the struggle occurs.

In describing the supposed variations in offspring under new conditions of life, Darwin considers them to be either 'indefinite' or 'definite.' The former consist of 'favourable' (i.e. adaptive) together with 'injurious' (or inadaptive) variations; out of which the former are supposed to be 'selected,' while the latter, the great majority, perish.

'Definite' variations arise when *all* the offspring vary alike and in a favourable (i.e. adaptive) manner. His words are:

The direct action of changed conditions leads to definite or indefinite results. By the term 'definite action' I mean an action of such a nature that when many individuals of the same variety are exposed during several generations to any change in their physical conditions of life, all, or nearly all the individuals are modified in the same manner. A new sub-variety would then be produced without the aid of selection.¹¹

This brings us to Darwin's alternative proposition to account for evolution, or 'The True Darwinism.' Forty-five years of observation have proved incontestably that it was the right one; while 'Darwinism,' as usually understood, still remains an unproved hypothesis. Hence I call the former 'The True Darwinism.' We find the first hint of it in the introduction to the first edition of the *Origin*, &c. (1859); in which he describes natural selection as being 'the main, but not the exclusive means of modification'; for, on page 11, he adds, 'some slight amount of change may, I think, be attributed to the direct action of the conditions of life.'

In 1868, or nine years after the *Origin* appeared, Darwin published his *Animals and Plants under Domestication*. In this work, in the passage already quoted, we see he had begun to realise the vast importance of 'definite action,' by which he means 'direct action' producing 'definite results.' Now the point especially to notice is that in the introduction he appeared to *blend* this 'definite action' with 'natural selection'; whereas in 1868 they have become *perfectly distinct* and *mutually exclusive*. That Darwin continued to perceive more and more clearly the importance of 'definite action' is proved by his letter to Professor Moritz Wagner in 1876, in which he wrote: 'The greatest mistake I made was, I now think, I did not attach sufficient weight to the direct influence of food, climate, &c., quite independently of natural selection. When I wrote my book, and for some years later, I could not find a good proof of the direct action [i.e. producing 'definite results'] of the environment on the species.¹² Such proofs are now plentiful.'¹³ They are really universal.

¹¹ *Animals and Plants under Domestication*, ii. p. 271; *Origin*, &c., pp. 6, 72, 80, &c.

¹² Nevertheless, his books incidentally abound with cases.

¹³ *Life*, vol. iii. p. 159.

We will now turn to the experiences of savants of to-day.¹⁴

The study of 'Ecology,' or of 'Plants at Home,' *i.e.* their structure and relationships to their conditions of life, has revealed to field botanists, at least, that not only can plants be called xerophytic, halophytic, hydrophytic, &c., but that the respective structures of such plants are in close adaptation to their environments, and are the 'definite results of the direct action of those conditions of life.' These results are due to *a responsive power residing in protoplasm and the nucleus, which at once set to work to construct tissues in adjustment to the influences of any changed environments.*¹⁵ *This is no theory*, for it can be witnessed in actual procedure both in nature, and easily by experiment. Moreover, it has been proved to be the case a quarter of a century ago and repeatedly since.

I will here give one of my experiments. No greater 'changed conditions of life' can well be found for a species than to live normally submerged, and then to live in ordinary garden soil in air. I sowed the seeds of the water crowfoot, say 200 in all. They came up at different rates. They *all* developed the fennel-like type of leaf characteristic of submerged plants, but the whole anatomical structure was changed in adaptation to air; subsequently the floating type of leaf appeared, then followed the flowers. There was not a single individual with any inadaptive structure (*i.e.* Darwin's 'injurious variation'). On transferring some of the plants to water, all the foliage perished at once, being inadapted to a submerged life, but new foliage soon appeared adapted to a submerged existence.

The following are the opinions of a few eminent ecologists upon 'adaptation.' Mr. J. A. Thomson, writing on 'Synthetic Summary of the Influence of the Environment upon the Organism,'¹⁵ says :

No attempt to explain the adaptation of the organism to its environment can be complete without recognition that external influences, in the widest sense and in various degrees of directness, have, and have had, an important transforming and adaptive action.

Professor Warming, of Copenhagen, in describing adaptations among xerophytic plants, remarks :

I answer briefly to the question which arises—namely, whether these adaptations to the medium should be regarded as a result of natural selection, or whether they owe their origin to the action, in modifying forms, *exercised directly* by the conditions of the medium. I adopt this latter view . . . the characters of adaptation thus directly acquired have become fixed.¹⁶

M. Costantin, speaking of Arctic plants, says :

We are led to think, so to say, invincibly, that one can only explain the general characters of Arctic plants by adaptation—*c.g.* if all Arctic plants are perennial,

¹⁴ I would refer the reader to *The Origin of Floral Structures*, and more especially to *The Origin of Plant Structures*, vols. lxiv. (1888) and lxvii. (1895), *Int. Sci. Ser.*

¹⁵ Royal Phys. Soc. Ed. (1888).

¹⁶ *Lagoa Santa*, p. 465 (1892).

it is because they live near the pole. It is the conditions of life which have created this hereditary character.¹⁷

Similarly, Dr. W. G. Smith, the well-known author of excellent botanical survey work, says, 'It is impossible to do this survey work without being impressed with adaptation.' I might quote others, especially of America, as well as Noll, Schenck, Bonnier, Flahault, of Germany and France. Even Dr. Weismann, who holds to Darwinism, is obliged to confess, 'we are driven to the conclusion that the ultimate origin of hereditary individual differences lies in the direct action of external influences upon the organism.'¹⁸

Now, besides Weismann, Darwinians assert that as the same results are obtained (?) by natural selection, they prefer to accept Darwin's theory. The reply is that a *theory* can explain anything; just as 'design' was once thought to put all questioning out of court; but until they can bring forward *facts* and *proofs* that natural selection really is capable of bringing about adaptations, the theory remains an *a priori* assumption still, and consequently is void of a true scientific basis. This, however, with one voice, they all decline to do. Wallace is satisfied by saying, 'It is, of course, admitted that direct proof of the action of natural selection is wanting.' I am not aware of any scientist resting satisfied with such a position in any other branch of science. If none can be found in fifty years, why retain the theory? On the other hand, an overwhelming mass of facts and proofs are present everywhere in favour of 'adaptation by response.'

Now, a most important fact is overlooked. Darwin used the word *chance* twice in one passage quoted above, italicising the word himself. In other words, if adaptive structures in animals and plants arose accidentally or by chance, and were preserved by natural selection, *there is no Natural Law* connecting the first appearance of the favourable variations with their adaptiveness. This is clear from Darwin's illustration of a 'noble and commodious edifice,' supposed to be built of unprepared stones, in order to show how an organism with all its adaptations appeared by 'chance variations':

If an architect were to rear a noble and commodious edifice without the use of cut stone, by selecting from the fragments at the base of a precipice wedge-formed stones for his arches, elongated stones for his lintels, and flat stones for his roof, we should admire his skill and regard him as a paramount power.

Now the fragments of stones, though indispensable to the architect, bear to the edifice built by him the same relation [as a matter of fact, there is *none* at all] which the fluctuating variations of each organic being bear to the varied and admirable structures ultimately acquired by its modified descendants.¹⁹

¹⁷ *Les Végétaux et les Milieux cosmiques*, p. 85 (1898).

¹⁸ *Essays on Heredity*, p. 279.

¹⁹ *Animals and Plants under Domestication*, ii. p. 430.

Darwin admits that, with regard to the use to which the fragments of stone may be put, 'their shape may be strictly said to be accidental.' The essential features which Darwin here completely overlooks are, first, that it is quite impossible to construct a 'noble and commodious edifice' out of unhewn and unprepared stones, and, moreover, with no prepared mortar. Secondly, one requires to know what replaces the intelligence and skill of both the architect and builder, in the case of making and putting together the adaptive structures of an organism. 'Adaptation,' as used by ecologists, means simply that the direct action of the altered conditions of life upon the protoplasm and nucleus of organisms calls forth their responsiveness, and adaptations follow at once. Hence the first appearance and rapid formation of adaptations are the immediate results of a *Universal Natural Law*.

The reader will now not fail to see the bearing of all this upon evolution. Why are the British spurges, e.g. species of *Euphorbia*, so totally different from the massive, succulent species of Africa; and why do the latter exactly mimic in form and structure the *Cactaceæ* of Mexico? Adaptation supplies the immediate answer. The English climate being totally different from the African, species have been evolved in adaptation to those climates respectively; just as *E. Paralias* is a xerophyte with coriaceous leaves, because it has adapted itself to a maritime situation in England. On the other hand, fleshy-stemmed *Euphorbias* resemble *Cactaceæ*, because they have become directly adapted to similar conditions of life.

So far induction is sufficient to 'prove' it. It is the line of argument suggested by Weismann, who says of evolution that the truth of it 'may be maintained with the same degree of certainty as that with which astronomy asserts that the earth moves round the sun; for a conclusion may be arrived at as safely by other methods as by mathematical calculation,'²⁰ or indeed experiment. But 'adaptation' by no means rests on induction alone. There is an abundance of experimental verification which has been made with regard to all kinds of plants, under various conditions of life. Five-and-forty years' study of plants, as growing in Nature, has long ago convinced me that Darwinism could not account for evolution; and it is at least gratifying to find that 'ecological' botanists, who study plants 'at home,' have now come to the same conclusion. A strong consensus of opinion already exists, from which Darwinians will assuredly discover ere long that the theory of 'the origin of species by means of natural selection' will disappear before 'adaptation to the conditions of life by means of the direct response of the organism.'

GEORGE HENSLOW.

²⁰ *Essays on Heredity*, p. 258.

THE GREEK MYSTERIES AND THE GOSPELS

IN a former number of this Review—March 1905—it was shown in ‘The Greek Mysteries and the Gospel Narrative’ (pp. 490–499) that certain technical or ritualistic words, and not a few sacramental formulæ, known to have been used in the Eleusinian mysteries, as well as several of the rites or ceremonies themselves, seem to be present in the gospel narrative under phrases but slightly veiled and in scenes only partially transformed; and in that article, with the object of illustrating these apparent facts, reference was made more particularly to the first-written gospel, Mark. In the present paper, in which some further examples are given, the illustrations will chiefly be taken from the three later writings.

In the former paper it was pointed out that in a religion or system of worship, the life of which was its symbolism, there must of necessity have been many outward and visible emblems which were regarded as types and figures of hidden spiritual truth, and mention was made (p. 493) of certain *ιερά* or ‘holy things’ which were never touched, nor even looked upon, save only by the priest and the ‘mystes’ during the midnight ceremony known as the *παράδοσις τῶν ἱερῶν*, and then apparently only when these sacred symbols were veiled or in some way accompanied by the mystical ‘linen cloth.’

But there were other figurative objects better known than the *ιερά*, because they were more publicly exhibited. These emblems or symbols seem to have been carried in procession before the statue of Iacchus (Dionysus), or to have been placed around him in his temple, on the sacred day which bore his name—generally supposed to have been the sixth day of the celebration. These mystic emblems have sometimes been called the toys and playthings of the infant god, and as such they may possibly have been regarded by the unenlightened world, but even by the profane these sacred objects were often looked upon as badges of deity and as marking in some mysterious way a divine presence. Among these emblems sacred to Iacchus in the Eleusinian worship Clement of Alexandria speaks of the *λίκνον*, ‘winnowing-fan’; the *σφαῖρα*, ‘globe’ or ‘ball’; the *πόκος*, ‘woolly

fleece'; and the ἀστράγαλος, 'bone' or string of bones. Clement of Alexandria was a Christian when he wrote his 'Protreptikos Logos' or 'Exhortation' to the Greeks, and he wrote it with the object of magnifying the Christian faith, and of ridiculing and defaming the mysteries; but of the true meaning and hidden teaching of the Greek system of worship he knew nothing, or if he had any knowledge of its mystic significance he carefully abstained from making it known.

First as to the λίκνον or 'winnowing-fan': this was 'a broad basket in which the corn was placed after threshing and then thrown against the wind so as to winnow the grain from the chaff.' No badge or symbol was more intimately associated with the worship of Iacchus (Dionysus) than was this basket or winnowing-fan; so closely was it identified with him that even a Roman poet, writing long before the time of Clement of Alexandria, seems unable to mention a winnowing-fan without speaking of it as 'the mystic fan of Iacchus' — 'mystica vannus Iacchi' (Verg. *Geor.* i. 166). In fact one of the mystic names of Dionysus (Iacchus) was derived directly from the 'fan,' for in certain of the celebrations he was invoked or worshipped as 'Licnites' — λικνίτης the 'winnowing-fan': thus when secret offerings were brought to the grave of Dionysus in the inmost shrine of Apollo's temple, the women on the neighbouring mountain of Parnassus in the night-time at the winter solstice woke up the new-born god, Δικνίτης, cradled in a 'winnowing-fan'; and at certain stages in the rites of the Dionysia the infant Dionysus or Iacchus was carried in solemn procession, lying in a λίκνον as in a 'cradle.'

Now in two of the four gospels, namely in Matthew (iii. 11-12) and in Luke (iii. 16-17), we meet with the 'winnowing-fan' in the Baptist's testimony concerning Christ, where the 'fan' seems to be regarded as a symbol or badge of divine power. The passage in Matthew (iii. 11-12) runs thus—'he will baptize you in a holy spirit (or, will immerse you in holy wind) and fire, whose winnowing-fan (τὸ πτύον) is in his hand, and he will completely cleanse his threshing-floor (ἄλωνα) and will gather together his grain into the barn.' Luke's version is a copy of this passage in Matthew with but slight variation. It is to be noticed that the word which appears in the two gospels is πτύον; of course the technical, ritualistic term λίκνον so intimately associated with Iacchus (Dionysus) could not have been used, for to have written οὐ τὸ λίκνον κ. τ. λ. would to a Greek have appeared precisely the same thing as writing 'behold! Licnites!—the Winnowing-fan with his fan'; yet the word πτύον signifies a 'winnowing-fan' quite as plainly as, perhaps even more clearly than, λίκνον expresses this meaning, for λίκνον is often used to signify a 'cradle' as well as a 'winnowing-fan,' whereas πτύον seems never to have this double meaning. Whence comes this idea of the 'fan'? It was not a badge of the Jewish Messiah; Matthew would certainly have told us of the fact if he had

ever found the 'winnowing-fan,' used in the Old Testament as a symbol of the Hebrew deliverer; but from whatever origin the word *πτύον* may be derived or from whatever source it may have come, it is here used in a sense as mystic and with a meaning as figurative as that of the 'mystica vannus Iacchi.'

So, with regard to the word *ἄλωνα*, 'threshing-floor,' *ἄλως* means something round or circular, and here signifies and includes the piled-up rounded heap of corn as well as and in addition to the circular threshing-floor itself—'he will winnow his stack of corn'; in any case, the notion of something circular is implied in the word *ἄλως*, which at times expresses the 'disc' of a shield, the 'halo' round the moon, or the 'ring' of a coiled snake, in short the distinctive feature of the *σφαῖρα*. The whole passage in verse 12 has the appearance of being a quotation from some sacred writing, yet it cannot be traced in the books of the Old Testament, or of being a religious formula accompanying some symbolical or mystic rite. We know that at Eleusis the threshing-floor of Triptolemus, herald of life and judge of the dead, was a sacred spot; each year at Eleusis the Rarian plain was solemnly ploughed, each year the sower went forth to sow that holy ground, each year the ears of corn there grown were solemnly cut—the mystic symbolism of life that dies only to live again, and of beauty that fades only to revive and blossom anew.

Before passing from this subject of the *λίκνον*, 'fan' or 'cradle,' it may be noted that Luke alone of the gospel writers speaks of the babe 'lying in a manger,' and he appears to make a point of the circumstance, for he uses the phrase twice within a few lines, that is to say, within five verses (Luke ii. 12, 16). Now whether the expression *κείμενον ἐν φάτνῃ* is intended to signify 'laid in a stable or cattle-yard' or 'lying in a feeding-trough or manger' is not quite clear; neither is it clear how it happens that Luke alone of all the gospel writers should have any knowledge or make any mention of the *φάτνη*, which, whether it be a 'manger' or whether it be a 'cattle-stall,' seems to be a cold, uneasy bed, in which to lay a new-born babe, and there the child remained still cradled in its strange cot until so 'found' by the shepherds (ii. 16, 12): or is the passage only a new interpretation—a transfigured rendering—of the old Greek rite and mystic act of worship in which the women on the mountain-side were wont to find at midnight on the shortest day their new-born god, Licnites, cradled in a corn-basket or winnowing-fan?

Let us look at another of the emblems mentioned by Clement, namely the *πόκος* or 'woolly fleece,' also spoken of as *Διὸς κώδιον*, the 'sheepskin of Zeus' or the 'fleece of god,' a sacred object which was laid upon the feet of sinners when they were purified and cleansed from their sins. Now the writer of the fourth gospel, rejecting all allusions by the Baptist to the winnowing-fan, makes him exclaim—

'Behold the lamb of the god which takes away the sin of the world' (John i. 29), the remarkable point in the narrative being that the persons who heard the exclamation are represented as at once understanding that the Jewish Messiah had been found (John i. 35-37, 40-41); as though the phrase 'the lamb of God' appealed to them as a well-known expression typical of the Messiah. If so, again, is it not strange that Matthew, with all his knowledge of the Old Testament, not only has no parallel passage from the Hebrew writings, but does not even mention the circumstance that the Baptist ever made use of such an expression as 'the lamb of god'; in fact this phrase does not appear in any of the four gospels with the single exception of John, and not again in John's narrative after the Baptist has left the scene. A Greek, on hearing the cry "Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, 'Behold! the lamb of the god!' might call to mind the 'fleece of god'—the *Διὸς κώδιον*—and see before him his redeeming god, Iacchus—(*Λυαῖος* "Ἰακχος), but would a Galilean fisherman recognise in this expression, even though it were uttered in Aramaic words, any reference to his Messiah (v. 37, 40-42)? Nor does the expression ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ occur again in the New Testament, for the word translated 'lamb' which appears so frequently in Revelation is not ἀμνός but is a totally different word, namely, ἀρνίον, the 'little ram,' a highly figurative creature with seven horns and seven eyes (Rev. v. 6, 8).

With regard to another of the symbols mentioned by Clement—namely, the ἀσπράγαλος or 'bone,' it is not clear what kind of bone the ἀσπράγαλος was; if it consisted of the ankle-bones of certain animals, then it would signify 'dice' for casting lots: if it was composed of vertebræ bones strung together, it would then mean a 'scourge.' Which of these meanings was attributed in the mysteries to the ἀσπράγαλος is not certainly known; possibly at different stages of the ceremonial different meanings were given to it. However this may be, we find both 'scourging' and 'casting lots' to be noticeable features in the gospel narrative: that is to say, these events appear to be narrated as facts or circumstances of which some mention must be made, although the reason for their occurrence is not apparent. It has been supposed that Psalm xxii. 18 is the origin of the story of the casting of lots by the soldiers, but this hypothesis can hardly be accepted, for the earlier gospels give no quotation from, nor make any reference to, this Psalm, the author of the fourth gospel apparently being the first writer to discover the parallel passage in the Old Testament (John xix. 24).

So the narrative of the scourging is sometimes thought to be due to the passage in Isaiah (liii. 5)—'with his stripes we are healed,' or, as it is given in the Septuagint, 'by his weal we were healed'—τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν; but this view seems scarcely tenable, for if the story of the scourging had been inserted in the narrative merely for the purpose of showing the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy,

we should almost certainly have found the word *μώλωψ*, 'weal,' or some similar expression introduced into the story together with the phrase 'that the scripture might be fulfilled.' But is the scourging for this reason any the more to be understood as an actual historical event? It can scarcely be accepted as an historical fact that the Roman Procurator came down from the *βῆμα* and himself administered this degrading punishment—degrading to the perpetrator rather than to the victim; yet the several accounts in the gospels seem to imply and even to assert that he did so, for the verbs used in each narrative are plainly written in the singular number—thus in Mark (xv. 15) and in Matthew (xxvii. 26) the words are *παρέδωκε φραγελλώσας*, and in John (xix. 1) *ἔλαβεν, ἐμαστίγωσε*; that is to say, the Governor of Judæa is represented as personally torturing a free man whom he had but a few moments earlier been striving to release (John xix. 39). It has been suggested that the narrative may be read as meaning that Pilate, having authorised the soldiers to administer the scourging, may, on the principle 'qui facit per alium facit per se,' be said to have himself inflicted it; but the last-written gospel, which not seldom corrects the earlier accounts, does not offer this explanation, but seems to assert, even more plainly than they appear to do, that Pilate himself and not the soldiers (John xix. 1, 2) committed this act, or rather these acts, of hideous brutality; and the short, matter-of-fact statement seems to read as the brief mention of some event which must be introduced into the narrative, rather than as a startling instance of judicial degradation possibly without a parallel in the Roman world. For, in whichever sense the story be understood, the result is the same; it represents the Roman Governor as torturing, or commanding the torture of, a free man, wholly innocent of any crime.

Let us now ascertain the place which the 'linen cloth' occupied in the Eleusinian celebration. It has been stated (p. 497) that 'some kind of memento of the ceremony (the *παράδοσις τῶν ἱερῶν*) was given by the priest to the votaries, which a believer used to keep in a linen cloth.' It is not certainly known what was the technical name given to this 'linen cloth' in the mysteries—possibly the term used was *βύσσος*, ἡ *βύσσος*, 'the cloth of fine flax,' a word having much the same meaning as *σινδών*, which seems to have been a kind of Indian muslin or lawn, 'a cloth of fine linen.' The memento given by the priest consisted of a small piece or fragment of one of the *ἱερά*, such as a crumb of the sesame cake, a seed of the pomegranate, or a grain of the salt, possibly—almost certainly—the last mentioned, the salt, which would be handed over to the mystes by the priest with some formula of which Mark ix. 49–50 may be a reminiscence or a paraphrase. A reason for selecting the salt as the memento, rather than a seed of the pomegranate or a crumb of the cake, would be that a grain or two of salt wrapped in a cambric or linen cloth would after a

time dissolve and disappear, so that should the 'linen cloth' ever fall into the hands of profane persons who might dare to take hold of it in the hope of looking upon a most holy object, their impious curiosity would be frustrated, the 'holy thing' would not be there, and the 'linen cloth,' would be left behind—empty, folded, and alone (*ἐντε-τυλιγμένη μόνη*). For the *ιέρá* were so sacred that the uninitiated were never permitted to look upon them 'even from the housetop.'

Whether this be so or not, it is plain that in the Eleusinian worship the 'linen cloth' occupied a conspicuous place, and was a necessary accompaniment during and immediately after the *παράδοσις*, or 'handing over' of the holy things; in fact so necessary an accompaniment does it appear to have been that, when we turn to the gospel narrative, we almost expect at the moment of Christ's *παράδοσις* to see some trace of the 'napkin of flax,' and, in the midnight gloom of Gethsemane, to catch a momentary glimpse of the 'linen cloth.' And do we not have a brief sight of it? For, in Mark (xiv.), after the 'fervent kiss' (*κατεφίλησεν*, v. 45), and before the 'taking away' (v. 53), there occurs this remarkable passage: 'And a certain youth [or attendant] was accompanying him, having a *linen cloth* (*σινδώνα*) cast about him over his naked body, and they take hold of him, but he left behind [or alone] *the linen cloth* (*τὴν σινδώνα*) and fled naked' (51-52). How came this young man or servant on the spot at this moment—was he sleeping in the grove? If so, he would have had a wrap or covering, less costly and certainly more substantial than the lawn-like *σινδών*. And why should the narrative be disturbed at so dramatic a moment by the intrusion of a trivial and meaningless episode? The later gospel writers seem to have had some such thought, for none of them mention, nor even allude to, this singular digression in Mark's narrative. In any case, here in Mark we have the 'linen cloth' brought upon the scene at the moment of the 'handing over' of Christ—not merely a 'linen cloth,' but *the* 'linen cloth,' just as in chapter xv. 46 we see the same word *σινδών* repeated, plainly with the object and for the purpose of prefixing the article—'wound him in *the* *σινδών*'; so here, 'he left *the* *σινδών* behind him and fled naked.'

And at this point let us look at the description or narrative of the act itself—the *παράδοσις*, the 'handing over'—as given by Mark [xiv. 44-45]: 'now he who is [or was] handing him over [*ὁ παραδίδους αὐτόν*] had given them a sign, [or password] saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss [*ὃν ἂν φιλήσω*], he it is [or, that is he], hold him [*κρατήσατε αὐτόν*] and lead [or take] him away carefully [or without faltering, *ἀσφαλῶς*]. And he came—came straight [*εὐθέως*, at once or openly] up to him, and saith, Rabbi, and fervently kissed him' [*κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν*, 'kissed him again and again']. In reading these words do we understand that the writer is intending to describe the blackest crime that ever stained the human race? Stained with many a stain, was it ever stained with one so black as this? The Greek language possesses

fitting words, plain and strong, with which to brand the perpetrator of such a deed, if deed it be ; but the writer of this passage finds no words plainer, no words stronger than the ambiguous, mystic, almost sacramental term, ὁ παραδιδούς, 'he who hands over,' as though the writer's mind was with the Eleusinian priest as he 'hands over' the holy thing to the awe-struck mystes, and bids him 'kiss' the holy thing and 'hold' it in his hand unfalteringly (ἀσφαλῶς) ; for κρατέω means to 'hold in the hand' as well as to 'subdue by force.' What need was there to urge this 'great multitude with swords and staves' (43) to 'subdue by force' or 'hold with the hand' their unarmed, unresisting prisoner, any more than to warn them to take him away carefully and without faltering (ἀσφαλῶς) ? And how is the use of such a word as κατεφίλησεν to be explained ? Καταφίλέω is far stronger than φιλέω ; it signifies the tender caressing kiss of the true lover, not the pretended salutation of a false friend ; in fact, by the presence in the narrative of this word κατεφίλησεν, the veil seems to be lifted, we have gone in under the curtain, and are looking upon the fervent kiss of the adoring mystes as he holds in his hand the holy thing, not the cold semblance of a greeting given by a traitor as the token of his treachery.

Our attention hitherto has been directed more particularly to the Eleusinia, but it must not be supposed that these are the only Greek mysteries of which traces are to be found in the gospels. For it would seem as though allusions to, or stories built up from, the ritual of the Thesmophoria, to which a passing reference was made in the former paper (p. 495), are discernible in all the gospel narratives ; but more especially in the fourth, the author of which appears to have had access to notes or documents not available to the earlier writers. We are told that 'there were many books of the mysteries containing the ritual to be performed in various cases, and also perhaps the allegorical and symbolical interpretations of some of the myths.' Such books, being compiled for the use of the priests and those mystæ who had attained to the higher grades, would be written more or less in outline, mystic names and formulæ being represented by a few letters, with here and there a technical word or a ritualistic phrase. Notes or memoranda such as these would necessarily present, at least to the uninitiated, only the skeleton of a story or the mere outline of a drama. Such books and notes must from time to time have fallen into the hands of the unenlightened, who would not fail to try their skill at filling in the blanks and reconstructing the drama, and even in discovering a religious explanation and symbolical interpretation of the mystic narrative and dramatic ritual.

It is impossible here to give even a summary of the ritual, or of the meaning of the ritual, in the Thesmophoria ; it must be sufficient to state that the same great principle—namely, life and the continuity of life—which was worshipped in the Eleusinian mysteries, was also, but under a different aspect and with a different ritual, invoked in

the Thesmophoria. For as in the Eleusinia men prayed for life in relation to the fruitfulness of the earth, so in the Thesmophoria women invoked life and the beauty of life, in reference to the fruitfulness of the human race, and called upon the Earth-mother, *γῆ μήτηρ*, as *καλλιγένεια*, or 'mother of the fair child.' The festival of the Thesmophoria was, in fact, a festival in celebration of marriage, more especially on the last day, which was known by the same name of *καλλιγένεια*. How long the celebration lasted is not quite clear; it is supposed to have been, at least in many Greek cities, of three days' duration, but at Athens it seems to have continued for five days; that is to say, if the preliminary rites and ceremonies at Halimus are to be included; but, generally speaking, the festival proper commenced on the day called the *ἀνοδος*, 'ascending,' or *κάθοδος*, 'descending'; on the third day from which date the feast of Kalligeneia, or 'mother of the fair child,' was held. Now in John (ii. 1) we read: 'And the third day was a marriage-feast in Kana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there.' On the third day from what event or fact this marriage-feast took place we are not told, but it is remarkable that in the line immediately above the expression 'the third day' occur the words, 'ascending and descending' (i. 51), where the word 'ascending,' *ἀναβαίνοντας*, if not altogether superfluous, is plainly misplaced; unless indeed the passage is but a transformation or mystic reconstruction of the *ἀνοδος κάθοδος*, or day of 'ascent and descent,' in the Thesmophoria.

And what of Kana of Galilee—is there any mention of such a place in the Old Testament, or in Josephus, or in Strabo, or in any one of the three earlier gospels? A Greek note or memorandum of the ritual of the Thesmophoria, made before the date of the gospels, would be written in uncial characters, without spaces between the words, and without accents or punctuation; thus ΚΑΛΛΙΓΕΝΕΙΑΣ might soon become ΚΑΝΑΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑΣ, more especially if originally written in a contracted form, as ΚΑΛΙΑΣ, for a mere slip of the pen would cause ΑΙ to appear as Ν, ΚΑΝΑΣ.

The procedure or ritual on the day of Kalligeneia—the *γάμος καλλιγενείας*—is not known in every detail, but it seems that a considerable portion of the day was occupied in holding a festival, or marriage-feast, at which much wine was drunk, the wine being provided by the two women who had been chosen or appointed to superintend the feast. During this day there occurred a remarkable ceremony, in which certain women, who had been set apart for the purpose, after undergoing a three days' purification, occupied a prominent position; they were called *ἀντληγρίαι*, 'drawers up,' and the act or ceremony which they performed was described by the word *ἀντλέω*, to 'draw up from the hold—*ἄντρος*—of a ship,' to 'draw up water from a depth or well,' to 'draw up from a hole or pit.' This peculiar rite will presently be further alluded to.

Now we find this word ἀντλέω twice used, namely in verses 8 and 9 (John ii.), and, as it would seem, almost inaccurately—‘and he saith unto them, Draw up now’ (ἀντλήσατε νῦν, v. 8). ‘Why does this word ἀντλέω appear here? There was no need nor necessity for ‘drawing up’ from any depth or hole as from an ἄντρος, or ‘ho’d,’ for the six waterpots had been filled ‘up to the brim’ (ἕως ἄνω—‘until above’); all therefore that was required of the servants was to dip a cup into the brimming liquid—an act which would be more exactly expressed by such a word as ἀφύσσω, to ‘draw liquids from a larger vessel with a smaller,’ or ἐμβάπτω, to ‘dip one vessel into another,’ or ἀρύω, to ‘draw water,’ any of which words would appear to express more accurately the meaning which seems to be intended than such a word as ἀντλέω, to ‘draw up from the dregs or bottom,’ to ‘exhaust’; and the word is repeated—‘the servants knew—they who had drawn up the water’—οἱ ἡντληκότες, ‘those who had been the drawers up’ (9). It would be difficult to find any expression more closely resembling the technical, ritualistic phrase of the Thesmophoria, αἱ ἀντλητρίαι, than these words οἱ ἡντληκότες. And the repetition of the expression seems, as it were, to mark or indicate the presence, in a transmuted form, of some technical term or sacred word, just as in the term or expression ‘the mother of Jesus’ (vv. 1 and 3), twice used, we seem to have a paraphrase or new rendering of the meaning of Καλλιγένεια, or ‘mother of the fair one.’ We have already noticed the use of the word σινδών, twice repeated, and shall presently draw attention to the repetition of another word, ἱκανός.

But it is now necessary to consider the extraordinary rite performed on the first day—the day of ascent and descent—of the Thesmophoria. The Greeks worshipped nature, or the forces of nature, and in order to bring these forces home to the mind of the ignorant and unenlightened, the particular force or power to be invoked was personified, that is to say, was represented as a being having perpetual or ever-returning life. Thus the Greeks saw in the life-giving power of the earth a living force, a life-producing spirit, which they personified as the ‘Earth-mother,’ γῆ μήτηρ, or Demeter, just as they recognised in the all-pervading, life-sustaining air their great Ζεὺς, father of gods and men. As soon as this personification was accepted, all the phenomena of nature became the acts of these ever-living beings, and in the Greek imagination the life and beauty of the world seemed to be the ‘fair child’ of the ‘Earth-mother.’ Thus it was that in the Eleusinia the life of the world was worshipped as Persephoné with the golden ears of corn, and in the Thesmophoria its beauty was invoked as the mystic Persephassa with her basket of poppies; and when the beauty of the world faded away and its life died down in the winter months, the Greeks, in vivid imagination, saw the ‘fair child’ of the ‘Earth-mother’ snatched

from them to the depths below by the 'dweller in the nether gloom.'

Thus Clement of Alexandria, in his *Protreptikos Logos*, writes:— 'Do you wish me to tell of Persephassa's flower-gathering and her basket and of her rape, how the earth split asunder and the swine of Eubulus were swallowed up with the disappearing deities; this is the reason why at the Thesmophoria they "entomb" swine by casting them into pits' (*μεγαρίζοντες χοίρους ἐμβάλλουσι*). And in a scholion on Lucian, published by Rohde from a Vatican codex—'It is in honour of this Eubulus that swine are cast into the chasms (*χάσματα*) of Demeter and Koré (Persephassa). When the bodies of the swine which have been cast into the crypts [or pits, *μέγαρα*] are decayed, certain women who are called *ἀντλητρίαι* [drawers up], after purifying themselves for three days, descend and bring them up. And a rattling is made when the women draw up [*ἀντλῶσιν*] the bodies, and when they put back [into the crypt or pit] those [well-known] figures' (*τὰ πλάσματα ἐκεῖνα*). The *πλάσματα* were small images of pigs which were thrown into the crypt or pit after the living animal had been driven into it and buried there, or were cast into the chasm when the remains of the dead pigs were drawn up by the *ἀντλητρίαι*. For though it is not distinctly stated in the above passages that the pigs were buried alive, this is probably the meaning, because we are told that at the Thesmophoria, as celebrated by the people of Potniæ in Boëtia, 'live pigs were driven down into crypts, as they are called' (*ἐς τὰ μέγαρα καλούμενα*); and 'at Onceum, near Thelpusa, in Arcadia, there was a hole or pit [*Βόθρος*] sacred to Demeter, into which live pigs were cast during the Thesmophoria.' That this entombing of pigs really took place is proved by the discovery of one of these crypts or pits at Halicarnassus by Sir Charles Newton; for when he opened it he found there 'the small figures of pigs in marble'—the *πλάσματα* above mentioned—'and at the very bottom of the hole the bones of swine and of some other animals.' Possibly at Athens and in the more cultured cities of Greece, at least in later days, the pig was killed in sacrifice before it was cast into the pit, in order to save it from the torture of being buried alive; but in early times, even in Attica, the practice was doubtless the same as in Boëtia, for the festival of the Thesmophoria seems originally to have been introduced into Attica from Tanagra, formerly called Gephyra, in Boëtia. Probably in many cities only one pig was buried alive, though perhaps in some places two were thus entombed, the remainder of the herd of Eubulus being represented by the small figures or images—*πλάσματα*—which were cast into the pit after the pig had been driven alive into the crypt or tomb.

Are not traces of this scene—the entombing ceremony of the Thesmophoria—to be found in the story of the Gadarene or Gergesene swine? Take Luke's account (viii. 26-37): 'And they arrived at the

region of the Gerasenes, which is over against Galilee' (26). Now it appears that there was no such place as Gerasa on the shore of the sea of Galilee, and whether the name Gerasa be only a word invented or built up from the letters of Megara and Gephyra or not, it seems to be unhistorical as a place on the sea-shore. This may account for the fact that the most ancient manuscripts are so completely at variance over this name; take, for instance, the Codex Sinaiticus, perhaps the oldest manuscript of the gospels in existence—certainly one of the oldest, for it may have been written, that is to say copied from an older document, in the fourth century—this codex apparently has the reading in Luke (viii. 26) 'Gergesenes,' in Mark (v. 1) 'Gerasenes,' and in Matthew (viii. 28) 'Gadarenes.' Nor is there any agreement in the readings of the older MSS. in this passage in Luke (viii.), for in verse 26, and again in verse 37, many ancient codices give 'Gergesenes,' whilst others have 'Gadarenes,' and others again read 'Gerasenes,' the last-mentioned word being the reading adopted in the Revised Version. These variances and uncertainties in the original text seem to point to the fact that the name of this place, whether it be called Gerasa, Gergesa or Gadara, is unreal, unhistorical. Again, in the next verse, 27, why should the demoniac 'remain (*ἔμμενεν*) in the tombs'? The body of the pig always 'remained in the tomb' for an indefinite period. And what is the significance of—'I beg of thee, do not torture me'—*μὴ με βασανίσῃς* (v. 28)? How could a 'spirit,' that is 'breath and air' (v. 29, *πνεῦμα*, *πνέω*, to 'blow,' the 'air we breathe') suffer torture in coming out of a man or in going into a pit? The pig would suffer torture in being buried alive in the crypt. So in verse 31, 'and they began to implore him that he would not command them to go away into the pit'—*εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*, 'into the abyss,' 'the crypt,' the *μέγαρον* of the Thesmophoria. 'And the herd rushed (*ὤρμησεν*) down over the edge into the lake and were stifled' (or 'suffocated,' *ἀπεπνίγη* v. 33). *Ἀποπνίγω* means to 'throttle,' to 'choke,' or 'suffocate,' and exactly expresses the stifling and suffocation of being buried alive, but the word seems very rarely to be used of drowning, for which reason Matthew avoids the expression, and in its place has (viii. 33) *ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι*, 'died in the waters.' So the verb *ὀρμάω*, here used intransitively, 'rushed' (*ὤρμησεν*), has also an active signification, and then means to 'drive,' 'urge on,' 'impel,' thus *ὤρμησαν τὸν χοῖρον κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὸ μέγαρον* would be 'they drove [pricked on or forced] the pig down over the edge into the pit.' And what is the meaning of *συνηρπάκει* in verse 29 (Luke viii.), translated in the Revised Version 'it had seized'? *Συναρπάζω* signifies to 'snatch and carry away with one'; no word could better express the act of the *ἀντλητρίαι* when they had descended to the bottom of the crypt or pit, for whether this word *συναρπάζω* appeared in the book of directions or not, the *ἀντλητρίαι* would, without doubt, hastily 'snatch up and carry

away with them' the remains of the pig, and return to the surface as quickly as possible, but why *συναρπάζω* should be used to describe the action of a spirit (*πνεῦμα*) agitating, or working within, a man, does not seem evident; the word does not occur in the narrative of either Mark or Matthew. So also the use of the word *ικανός*, 'sufficient' or 'befitting,' with the meaning of *πολύς*, 'much' or 'many,' is unusual; and the expression in v. 27, *ἐκ χρόνων ικανῶν*, 'from sufficient times,' or 'for a sufficient (or befitting) time,' in the sense of 'long,' 'for a long time,' is the more remarkable because in the next verse but one there occurs the usual and ordinary phrase *πολλοῖς χρόνοις* (29), 'for a long time,' or 'on many occasions.' Why should *ικανός* be used in v. 27 and *πολύς* in v. 29? In any book of rules or directions for the entombing ceremony, *ικανός*, 'sufficient,' would be the word made use of to express the length of time during which the body of the pig should 'remain in the tomb' or crypt; thus, 'the body remains (*μένει*) in the pit a sufficient time'—*ἐκ χρόνου ικανοῦ*—that is to say, 'sufficiently' long to become 'sufficiently' decayed. And this word *ικανός* is repeated in v. 32 with much the same meaning as is given to it in v. 27: 'Now there was there a herd of sufficient [or befitting] swine,' *χοίρων ικανῶν*; in the Revised Version it is rendered 'a herd of many swine.' Why should not the common and ordinary word *πολλῶν* be used in this passage in Luke, as it is, in fact, used in Matthew (viii. 30)? The book of rules or regulations for the entombing ceremony would of necessity have directions respecting the *πλάσματα*, or the figures, which were to be cast into the crypt—directions, that is to say, enjoining the priest to provide 'sufficient' *πλάσματα*, *πλάσματα χοίρων ικανῶν*, 'figures of sufficient swine,' the precise number being left to the discretion of the priest. Neither Mark nor Matthew has the word *ικανός*—Mark using *μέγας* (v. 11), *ἀγέλη μεγάλη*, 'a great herd'; and Matthew *πολύς* (viii. 30), *ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν*, 'a herd of many swine.' Of course this word *ικανός* can be, and is occasionally, used with the meaning of *πολύς*, otherwise it could not have appeared at all in Luke's narrative; it occurs, in fact, with this meaning on several occasions in this gospel, for instance in ch. vii. 12, *ὄχλος ικανός*, 'much people' or 'a considerable crowd,' and in ch. xx. 9, *χρόνους ικανούς*, 'a long time,' but this is not the ordinary and usual meaning of *ικανός*. It seems that the reading *ικανοί* in ch. vii. 11, 'many' disciples, though admitted into the Received Text, has been rejected without even a marginal note by the revisers. In v. 6 of the same chapter (vii.) *ικανός* occurs with the meaning of 'fit' or 'worthy.'

In comparing the three accounts of the Gerasene (Gergesene, or Gadarene) swine, it is apparent that Luke's narrative represents an earlier version than that of either Mark or Matthew—that is to say, Luke's story is derived from some note or document that has under-

gone less editing and revision than the writings upon which the other evangelists founded their narratives. But Mark and Luke agree in one noticeable particular—namely, in the use or introduction into the story of a Latin word where an Aramaic name or term might have been expected and would have appeared more probable, for the word *λεγεών* (v. 30) is only 'legio' in one of its Greek forms, *λεγιών* being the other and perhaps the more usual way of spelling in Greek the Latin word. Why should the Gadarene, in answer to the question 'What is thy name?' give in reply a Latin word? The dialogue was apparently in Aramaic, and it was only necessary for the purpose of the story that the demoniac should use some word importing a large but indefinite number. There were many words in Aramaic, such, for instance, as 'flock' or 'herd,' which would have this meaning, and would have answered the purpose. Why, then, should a Latin word appear in the narrative? It would seem as though the original constructor of this story for some reason felt bound or constrained to introduce into the tale a name or word beginning with the four letters λ ε γ ε, and he, a Greek, would know that there was no true Greek word commencing with these four letters and signifying a large number, but he would also know that the Latin word 'legio' might be written in Greek *λεγεών* as well as *λεγιών*, and that its meaning fulfilled his requirement by importing an indefinite but large number—the Roman legion varied from four to six thousand men. But why should the first author of this story feel bound to introduce and work into his narrative a word beginning with these four letters?

The first constructor of this tale, building it up from the notebook of the entombing rite, would find there the word *λέγε* in the direction to the priest—*λέγε πλάσματα τῶν χοίρων ἱκανά κ. τ. λ.*— 'here select (or, pick up) a sufficient number of images of the pigs, wait until the *ἀντλητρίαι* have ascended (or been drawn up), then cast the images *εἰς τὸ μέγαρον*,' 'into the pit.' It is to be noticed in Luke's account (30, 31) that the expression 'into the pit,' *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*, occurs within a few words—fourteen in the Greek text—of *λεγεών*. Of course the ceremonial, ritualistic phrase, *εἰς τὸ μέγαρον*, could not have been used by the first constructor of the story, but in the words *εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*, 'into the pit,' 'into the abyss,' he has produced a paraphrase in meaning most closely approaching it. So also the word *λέγω* (*λέγε*) has several different significations; thus it may mean to 'call by name.' Does this explain or account for the question, 'What is thy name?'? In Mark's version (v. 9) the repetition of the word *λεγεών*, 'legion,' in v. 15 is to be noted. As regards Matthew's account (viii. 28-34), it is plainly not taken from the original story used by Mark or Luke; and Luke, though writing after Mark, clearly did not use Mark's source of information, but some earlier version, for Luke's narrative bears evidence of having been

derived from a more archaic form of the tale than that from which Mark obtained his information. It thus becomes evident that, before any of the gospels which we possess were written, there must have been extant at least three distinct and separate versions of this story of the Gadarene swine.

These facts, and the matters noticed in the former paper, seem to point to the conclusion that the influence of the Greek mysteries upon the earliest Christian writings was greater and went further back than is generally supposed. How and when that influence commenced, and how great was its extent, are questions which cannot adequately be discussed at the conclusion of a paper like this; but it may well be believed that a religion of symbolism, such as the Eleusinian worship, which for nearly a thousand years satisfied the intellect while it stimulated the imagination of a people like that of Athens—it may well be that such a religion from its earliest days possessed some germ of truth, and that its mystic torch in olden time was lighted with fire drawn from some divine altar. Such a religion could not have passed from the world without leaving as a successor some form of faith and worship in type and teaching fashioned on itself: in type scarcely less mystic, in its teaching hardly more true; a faith and worship cleansed of much of the husk of the earlier Greek system, and pruned of much of the overgrowth of its later sensuous ritual, but a faith, nevertheless, to the true understanding of which the same life-giving principle of the mysteries was a necessary and essential element—namely, the principle which teaches that a spiritual or symbolical interpretation alone yields truth, whilst a carnal or literal acceptance profits nothing. The spirit quickens; the flesh is of no avail.

SLADE BUTLER.

FÉMINISME' IN FRANCE

THE woman's movement is characteristic of the times. Its influence is felt all over Europe, even in conservative Turkey. In France and in England it has followed much the same course and exhibited much the same phenomena. Yet the differences in the two cases are essential. The most striking is due to the fact that in France there are no distinguished persons to head the movement. It springs from the middle and lower classes, and is the outcome of the efforts of a group of enlightened women who, having freed themselves from the prejudices that hedge about their sex, have crowned their emancipation by claiming the vote. The 'femme du monde,' the woman of fashion, holds resolutely aloof. There are no aristocratic names associated, as in England, with the claim of women to political and social rights. An instant's consideration of the differing conditions in France will show why this should be so. The woman of superior social position has been educated in the convent, and contact with the Sisters is not likely to give her a sympathy with so modern, so unauthorised an outburst as the Woman's Rights movement. Being by her clerical education opposed to the Republic, her claim to be admitted to the franchise would immediately be held to be suspect. Indeed, much of the opposition, passive or active, to the feminine vote is inspired by the fear that a large proportion, and possibly the majority, of women in France are reactionary in their political ideals.

The woman's movement goes hand-in-hand with Socialism in France. It shows the same tendency to exaggeration of all effort that breaks fresh ground. Having repudiated the old-fashioned doctrine of woman's subserviency to man, 'Féministes' of the advanced school tilt at the institution of marriage. They hold that in its present form it abases the woman. It is not dignified that she should receive her sustenance from the husband; she must contribute her share to the domestic fund, and must have the right to be recognised as a wage-earner. Socialism is, theoretically, on the side of the angels. It admits the right of woman to take her part in the counsels of the nation, yet in practice the party has proved an uncertain friend. The most active exponent of Socialism is the Labour

party, but the Labour party is controlled by the 'Syndicats,' or Trades Unions, who are opposed in practice to admitting woman to compete with man in the diverse industries. Though, as I write, a M. Chéron, a Brittany deputy, has declared his faith in woman's rights, his determination to espouse her cause in the Chamber, it is significant that he is the only politician who has dared to associate himself definitely with the cause.

In political conception the Labour party in France is more advanced than in England, but its attitude towards woman is tinctured with the most intense conservatism.

Strikes have occurred with the object of inducing masters to drive out female labour. It is contended by men that the competition of women is an unfair competition, resulting in the lowering of wages. But it is a fact that man does not invite woman to form part of his organisation, hence it is difficult for her to obtain a higher wage. It is also undeniable that the woman can and does live more cheaply than the man; she is more sober, more patient in humdrum work, less given to political agitation, and less rebellious against discipline. In industries where the operations are light and mechanical she is the ideal worker. But she is not paid as much as her male competitor, and the reason, according to 'Féministes,' is that she has no vote.

But the woman's movement has made astonishing progress in other directions. They are practical directions. It is almost impossible to take up a journal, a review, or a novel without finding some reference to this new agitation. The narrow round of domestic life, though it may still satisfy the majority, is insufficient for an intellectual *élite*. Women plead at the bar, practise medicine, write and edit newspapers. The sex is conquering a new place for itself in the world of art; it has obtained amongst others the privilege of competing for the Prix de Rome. It is astonishing that, notwithstanding this great advance in education and opportunity, woman in a political sense is almost where she was in Roman times. Roman law is, of course, the basis of the Napoléonic code. The masterful Corsican has been able to impress his personality, his laws, and his prejudices upon Frenchmen nearly a hundred years after his death. Napoleon put the constitution, as well as the civil and penal laws of the country, into a cast-iron form. Practically the same system of centralisation of great departments of State exists to-day as in his time, and also his conception of the *role* of woman as something subsidiary and subordinate. The women who agitate most strongly for the suffrage complain of the lukewarmness of their sex. It is a fact that many Frenchwomen regard it as bad form to appear to have political ambitions. They fear to lose charm in the eyes of men. As the majority of Frenchwomen are still educated in the expectation of obtaining husbands, the verdict of the sex has

an immense influence upon their own mode and expression of thought. Women of the higher classes in France are perhaps too petted and live too luxurious a life to be very earnest about the lives and fortunes of their sisters in other strata of society. It will be a long time, probably, before these women turn a sympathetic ear to the demands of the women workers. Their old education, and the priestly influence under which they come, are entirely opposed to these new hopes of womanhood.

It has been urged that, as military conscription exists in France, woman cannot reasonably be endowed with the franchise, since she is not enrolled in her country's defence.

To this 'Féministes' reply that if woman does not bear arms she bears the soldier. The latter function, it may be supposed, is as great a service to the State as the former.

There is a middle territory of 'Féminisme,' upon which many moderate people take their stand. It consists in vindicating the right of woman to earn her living on the same terms as man. Every avenue of employment suitable to her powers must be opened to her. She must be allowed to adopt any profession for which her nervous organisation fits her. This widening of the field of feminine employment becomes all the more imperative because the marriage rate shows a tendency to recede, and the age at which marriage takes place to grow later and later. In bourgeois families the father finds it increasingly difficult to provide a *dot* for his daughters, and the dowerless girl has no alternative but to make her way in the world as an employee of commerce. She finds, probably, that her aptitudes and her education fit her less for a position of this sort than if she had been a pupil of the communal school.

The 'Féministe' movement is making progress, and is bound to make progress, even in quarters where prejudice and long tradition exist in an especial degree. It may be supposed that, in a not very distant future, the old families of the ancient Faubourg St. Germain will realise that an honest employment is not derogatory from a proud blazon, and that the dowerless daughter of a penniless nobleman is infinitely more womanly and worthy of respect in following a calling suited to her talents and inclination than waiting for a husband who may be some *parvenu* supplying the gold in exchange for the rank.

But the prejudice against the working woman is deeply ingrained in French society. It exists even among persons in very moderate circumstances. The little functionary of the post-office would be horrified if his son were to marry a girl who had some occupation of her own that took her from the domestic fireside. The tiniest *rente* makes her a 'demoiselle,' a 'femme du monde' almost; the least profession of business degrades her in the eyes of the 'concierge.' Nevertheless France supplies more working women than, probably,

any other country in Europe. At least 60 per cent. of the feminine population work. The husband follows his occupation in the shop or factory; his wife is employed as 'femme de ménage,' or in some similar capacity. This arrangement has its effect upon the population tables, tending to restrict child-birth and to cause children to be placed out with a 'baby farmer' in the country, the parents being themselves unable to look after their offspring. It is, from this point of view, certainly unfortunate. But the main question is that woman has to work; in many cases she can no longer be supported. Sometimes she makes a virtue of necessity, and claims the right to work. Whether she does so or not, it is common humanity, it is justice, it is equity to tell her: 'Your sex is no bar either to employment or to its proper remuneration.'

There are many employments of an official and routine character for which the woman seems especially qualified. It is a melancholy feature of the time that many young Frenchmen, robust and well fitted for the struggle of life, are content to pass their lives in a heated and badly ventilated public office, performing operations that are almost mechanical, which could be done perfectly by women. They are tempted by the regularity of the small salary and the sureness of the position. This state of things points to a lack of manly initiative and vigour. Moreover, it has its reflex on politics. The men who fill the public offices frequently owe their position to political 'pull.' They are not there because they are really wanted by the State, but because they or their fathers have been useful to some deputy. This overcrowding of the civil services is one of the reasons why the Budget presents the disquieting phenomenon of a perpetual increase though the population does not expand, and there has been no serious war for five-and-thirty years. It is because each successive Republican ministry finds the distribution of offices indispensable to power. Every outgoing Government is forced to fee its supporters. M. Clemenceau tilts against excessive officialdom in his programme.

The woman's movement in France has been baptised 'Féminisme.' It owes its title to an international congress which was held in 1892, and was called 'Congrès Féministe.' The younger Dumas first invented the term, but it had another significance—it meant the psychological study of woman, just as one might apply the expression to the novelists of the day who treat of the 'Eternal Feminine.' This congress of 1892 was succeeded by a still more remarkable gathering—the congress of 1900, held in connection with the Great Exhibition. It was remarkable because it was placed under the direct patronage of the Government, though the authorities have not shown anything more than an academic interest in the subjects discussed by the most advanced women of Europe and America. The motto of that congress is the watchword of militant 'Féminisme'—'The declaration of the rights of man includes the rights of woman.'

The accomplishment of that wish was not as near as Victor Hugo imagined when he uttered his famous prophecy that the nineteenth century would see the enfranchisement of women. Nevertheless, the direct political power of woman is growing. This result was largely attained by the pertinacious efforts of that pioneer in 'Féminisme' Marguerite Durand, who founded a remarkable women's paper, *La Fronde*, in 1889. The *Fronde* has now ceased to exist, but its works live after it. During its career, when its broad sheet thundered against masculine prejudice, a certain series of reforms was carried out. Women are now allowed to give evidence as to the signing of documents of which they have personal knowledge, and in matters of that kind; they are allowed to vote for the commercial tribunals; they are admitted to the Council of the Assistance Publique or Poor Law Board; they can compete in the examinations for the prizes of the Beaux-Arts, including the coveted Prix de Rome; they can vote and are eligible for the Superior Council of Labour. A Bill known as the Loi Goiraud has passed the Chamber protecting woman's earnings. (It has not yet passed the Senate, where it seems to be hung up indefinitely.) Finally, after a certain struggle, woman succeeded in 1900 in obtaining the right to plead as a barrister, which is sufficiently noteworthy, considering the disdainful attitude of the Code Civil towards the sex, and the natural inference that lawyers would share the prejudices of the lawgiver. There has also been a Bill called the Seats Act, which has compelled shopkeepers and manufacturers to provide seats for their female hands. Yet, curiously enough, France, which led the way in the declaration of the rights of man, is behind Russia in the rights of woman. In England woman has the privilege of sitting upon certain public bodies, and she has full power over her own fortune. In America certain States give her the vote. But in France the woman is still bound by the old Roman law.

In certain senses woman is worse off with factory legislation than she was before it existed. Under the old and often, no doubt, insanitary conditions the wife and the children worked at home at the husband's trade. They assisted him, and their joint labour replenished the family purse. Now the operations are carried on in the factories. Stress of competition and other causes have compelled a large abandonment of home industries, and the result is that the woman often finds herself excluded from profitable work. With the best of intentions successive Governments have endeavoured to regulate her labour in the factories, limiting overtime and abolishing night work. The result has been not to improve the social well-being of the woman, but to discourage the employer from employing her at all. These limitations have become so prejudicial to woman's interests that she has prayed the legislature, through her representatives in various congresses, to refrain from protecting her labour

unless man's labour is likewise 'protected.' 'We want no protection, but full liberty,' is the cry of the 'Féministe.'

The advocates of the rights of women are generally to be found among the Socialists. On the other hand, there is, as I have already indicated, a large class of thoughtful, intellectual women in France, represented by Daniel Lesueur and Marcelle Tinayre, two well-known novelists, who stay short of political demands and only claim the full right to labour. Daniel Lesueur insists that woman should be given technical education, so that she may be the equal of man in skill and craftsmanship; Madame Tinayre preaches, through her latest and most successful book, *La Rebelle*, the new gospel of the relation of the sexes. Woman must be treated as an equal by the man, demanding neither his protection nor promising obedience. For this reason she must work to secure economic independence. It is the battle-cry of the revolt of the sex. The discussions in the various emancipation societies that exist in Paris show how thoroughly this idea of a reformed and generous marriage tie has entered into the conception of the 'Féministe.' She would have neither man's dominance nor the counterpart, his protection. Her work should be paid for, just as his is. Where it is confined to the household the legislature should recognise her claim to one-third of the husband's wages, not for mere housekeeping expenses, but as her salary for work in the home. 'To administer a household properly is as difficult as to conduct a ministry,' observed one of the orators at the Great Exhibition Congress. The difficulties, the absurdities even, to which such a law would give rise do not appear to weigh with the Socialists. They are anxious and ready for the experiment.

Naturally a marriage conceived on such lines—husband and wife contributing to the family purse, and treated in the eyes of the law as associates—differs essentially from the institution imagined by the Christian Church. Many preach openly that marriage should be converted into an easily resolvable contract, whereby a couple agree to live together as long as there is perfect harmony, and to separate when the harmony no longer exists. Indeed, I might go farther and say that many persons of the advanced school—persons of unblemished moral life—are putting their theories into practice, and braving public opinion by disregarding the sanction of holy matrimony. Such a tendency appears to be on the increase, though the motive may not always be as pure. It is also to be said that the institution of marriage is certain to undergo great changes in the future from the circumstance that an Extra Parliamentary Commission is occupied with its reform, in the sense of rendering divorce easier in cases where the difference between the couple is irreconcilable and their continued cohabitation a moral affront. Socialists also pin their faith to co-education; they would bring up the sexes together in the schools—a system which is said to give good results in America. Some would modify the

feminine garments, so as to allow greater freedom of action for the indulgence of sports. These reformers, apparently, do not stay to consider whether, in making these radical changes in environment, in education, and in costume they would not destroy entirely the charm of the sex and the variation in training, temperament, and character that makes the contemplation of the feminine mind so delightful and inspiring a study for man. These are the Socialist aims ; but, first and foremost, and as the basis of them all, comes the claim for the vote. According to statistics, half the work of France is performed by women. Their advent, therefore, to the ballot-box would be fraught, surely, with surprising changes.

CHARLES DAWBARN.

DAWN OF A NEW POLICY IN INDIA

SINCE the notable Resolution issued twenty-one years ago by Lord Dufferin on the memorial of the Central National Mahommedan Association no more important declaration of policy has emanated from the head of the Indian Government than the reply of the Viceroy to the Mahommedan Deputation that waited on him at Simla on the 1st of October. For although Lord Minto spoke with a certain reserve, which was only natural under the circumstances, there can hardly be any question his words indicate the general attitude of his Government towards the Mussulmans of India. Apart from its importance as a political pronouncement, it shows a clear appreciation of the existing situation and the growing difficulties of British administration, helped by its own extraordinary tendency to lean more or less exclusively on one element in the work of government. It shows, further, that the State begins to realise its responsibility towards the Mussulman people and the unwisdom of overlooking their interests in the multiplicity of claims pressed upon its attention with unvarying persistency by more articulate sections of the Indian nationalities. Hitherto, according to general Mahommedan opinion, the eyes of Government—with a short interlude—have been fixed on one class. Lord Minto's tactful and sympathetic reply bids them hope for a change.

The resolve of the Mahommedans, after a lapse of twenty-three years, again to approach the Viceroy personally points to a consciousness of the danger that lies before them, if they remain dormant and devoid of political life and activity much longer, of becoming entirely submerged under the rising tide of an exclusive nationalism.

The Deputation is the first concerted action on their part, conceived in a constitutional spirit without implying offence to any other people, to assert their rights to equitable treatment as subjects of a common sovereign—a treatment which certainly from their point of view has so far not been extended to them.

Not that the necessity for such united action did not present itself to them before; for, as early as 1882, it was perceived by the more thoughtful that the course events were taking rendered some collective effort to safeguard their interests absolutely essential.

The increasing preponderance of the majority in all departments of the State, the indifference, not to say intolerance, of the official classes towards Mussulman needs and wishes, their own disintegration in some parts, and political inaction everywhere, had almost completely driven them into the background. Although in Upper India the conflict of special interests had not assumed an overt shape, the subsequent controversy about the Urdu language and character, decided by Sir Antony Macdonell against the Mahommedans, showed that even there the balance required adjustment.

To obtain some amelioration of the situation, a scheme was set on foot for holding in Calcutta and other principal cities of India annual conferences of representative delegates to discuss questions affecting the material and educational development of the Mussulman community under the auspices of the British Crown, to advise Government as occasion arose with regard to their needs and requirements, and to give it every assistance in the promotion of the general well-being. Such conferences were not meant to be in any sense exclusive or antagonistic to any other community, but were rather to work in conjunction with other organisations in the advancement of national welfare. The scheme came to naught, owing to the opposition of some leading Mahommedans, whose eyes were fixed in a different direction. Two years later came the 'National Congress,' which, by a vigorous propaganda and the free use of the methods commonly called 'political agitation,' has acquired a remarkable, although perhaps unacknowledged, ascendancy in the counsels of Government. In this it has been greatly assisted by outside help, which has always been denied to the Mahommedans. This denial of sympathy and support to the Mussulmans is due, perhaps, as much to a bias against their religion as to the general lack of the talent to ingratiate themselves with people of influence, whether officials or travelling philanthropists.

Besides the Bharata Dharma Mandal, which ostentatiously proclaims for its object the regeneration of India on strictly orthodox lines, the 'National Congress' is the most active organisation for giving expression to the vast aims and aspirations of the majority. Its sphere of activity is widening in every direction; it keeps at arm's length uncongenial elements, and suppresses dissent within and unfriendly criticism outside by boycott and denunciations. The goal of the 'Moderates' and 'Extremists,' into which it has been divided by recent political writers, is the same, only the method of reaching it is different.

These remarks are conceived in no unfriendly spirit, for I admire the ability and consistency of purpose which have enabled its leaders to attain its present success and solidarity.

A few Mahommedans have thrown in their lot with the Congress; and, although they have exposed themselves to some ridicule, their

motives are intelligible and not unreasonable. They believe a few scraps to be better than none, and think that under an avowed *régime* of the majority they would have a far better chance than now of sharing in the proverbial 'loaves and fishes.' But so far the bulk throughout the country have held aloof. They have pinned their faith on the permanence of British rule in India as the only means under present conditions of her continuous development,—as the only means to prevent anarchy within or invasion from outside.

Their attitude has been influenced not so much by the exhortations or advice of any particular individual as by the general consciousness that without any positive safeguarding guarantee—which, in view of the exclusive spirit that had sprung up in many quarters, *malgré* the protestations at the top, it was impossible to obtain—the interests of the minority were sure to go under. They felt that their interests were certain to be relegated to the background, to be treated as of no consequence compared to those of the majority. And this is the view which the Mussulman memorial reflects.

In a State organism principally consisting of two distinct elements, one strong by its number and the general intelligence, ability, and political consciousness of its educated sections, the other virile, animated by those traditions of power and learning which impart backbone to a nation, equally intelligent but lacking the ready aptitude of adaptation and backward in the spirit of organisation and 'pushfulness,' the Government has chosen to leave the less practically active element neglected and depressed. Whether this policy has brought it any strength or earned the gratitude of either party the future historian of India will be able to answer.

By an irony of fate the necessity for a constitutional movement on the part of the Mahomedans to obtain in some measure a restoration of the balance seems at this juncture to be appreciated most at Allyghur. It has taken a quarter of a century to enforce the lesson that, even under fairly progressive Governments, in the struggle for existence and race for progress, no nationality can allow itself to be lulled into sleep without facing the defeat which overtook the hare in the old-world fable.

Barely two months ago I noted in this Review ¹ the peculiarly difficult position occupied by the Mussulman subjects of his Majesty :

Whilst the non-official Anglo-Indian and the Hindu communities possess powerful institutions for safeguarding their rights and privileges and asserting their claims to consideration and fair play, the Indian Mussulmans are suffering acutely from political inanition. Material decadence and general want of touch with modern thought have brought about a deplorable state of disintegration. The associations that exist in different parts of the country possess no solidarity and display no conception of the essential requirements of the community. There is no concerted action to prevent further decline of their people, to

¹ August 1906, 'India and the New Parliament.'

promote their advancement, to place before Government their considered views on public matters, or to obtain relief from the mischiefs arising from the misunderstanding of their laws and customs.

To find one nationality not pressing its claims to an equal recognition of its rights is undoubtedly an advantage; it saves embarrassment. Thus, generally speaking, the Mussulman, whilst he is patted on the back for holding aloof from what is called 'political agitation,' and told to apply himself like a good boy to his books, when it comes to practical treatment is relegated to the cold shade of neglect. Official statistics show that in Upper India the proportion of Mahomedans receiving education is greater than that of their Hindu fellow-subjects. In the other provinces they have admittedly made great progress. And yet in the matter of public employment or official recognition they are as unfavourably situated as ever. The reason is simple. They have no political influence, and cannot make their voice properly heard in the council-chamber or office-room.

And I ventured to add :

It must not be supposed that the Mussulmans are devoid of the political instinct or oblivious of the value of collective action. They note as keenly as any other people the signs of the times; and in this lies the seriousness of the situation. In the absence of a recognised organisation capable of expressing freely and openly the sentiments and opinions of the Mahomedans as a body, the feelings of the masses are likely to take a wrong shape and find outlet through unregulated channels.

In studiously moderate language the memorialists have sounded a similar note of warning :

The Mussulmans of India [they say] have hitherto placed implicit reliance on the sense of justice and love of fair dealing that has always characterised their rulers, and have in consequence abstained from pressing their claims by methods that might prove at all embarrassing; but, earnestly as we desire that the Mussulmans of India should not in the future depart from that excellent and time-honoured tradition, recent events have stirred up feelings, especially among the younger generation of Mohamedans, which might, in certain circumstances and under certain contingencies, easily pass beyond the control of temperate counsel and sober guidance.

In spite of the bogey of Pan-Islamism, conjured up by fevered brains, which is responsible for much wild talk in the public press of England and France, the perspective of Anglo-Indians, officials and non-officials, as regards Mahomedans, has considerably altered within recent years. They are regarded now as one of the most loyal nationalities of India; in fact, their loyalty has come to be recognised as one of the 'bulwarks' of the British Empire. It is felt that to neglect any longer a people which, by its self-control under the most trying circumstances, has shown itself worthy of help and support, would be equally unjust and impolitic.

At this moment a Commission, appointed by the Viceroy at the invitation of His Majesty's Secretary of State, is deliberating over certain proposals to afford a larger scope for the employment of qualified Indians in the higher departments of State service, to further

enlarge the Legislative Councils, and to extend the principle of election. All these subjects are admittedly of the utmost importance to the Indian Mussulmans. To have missed the opportunity of representing the Mahommedan side of the question would have been fatal. For no thoughtful Indian, whatever his politics, can believe that the progress of India can be promoted by depressing or keeping in the background one nationality in favour of another.

The memorial presented by the Deputation, although it omits to notice one or two points, expresses in moderate and dignified language the views and feelings of the Mahommedan people with respect to the questions before the Commission. Neither their moderation nor their self-restraint will spare the memorialists from the sectional indignation to which all attempts to seek justice for another body are exposed. But the prayers are so well-founded and legitimate that they cannot fail to command the approval and sympathy of every class interested in the welfare of India.

The memorial presents for the consideration of Government two questions, viz.: (1) the employment of the Mahommedans in the service of the State; and (2) their representation on the Provincial and Viceregal Councils, on the Municipal and Local Boards, and on the Senates and Syndicates of the Indian Universities. With regard to the first they say:

We beg to observe that the political importance of a community to a considerable extent gains strength or suffers detriment according to the position the members of that community occupy in the service of the State. If, as it is unfortunately the case with the Mohamedans, they are not adequately represented in this manner, they lose in the prestige and influence which are justly their due. We therefore pray that Government will be graciously pleased to provide that, both in the gazetted and the subordinate and ministerial services of all Indian provinces, a due proportion of Mohamedans should always find place. Orders of like import have, at times, been issued by local Governments in some provinces, but have, unfortunately, not in all cases been strictly enforced, on the ground that qualified Mohamedans were not forthcoming. This allegation, however true it may have been at one time, is no longer tenable now; and wherever the will to employ them is not wanting the supply of qualified Mohamedans, we are happy to be able to assure your Excellency, is greater than any possible demand. Since, however, the number of qualified Mohamedans has increased a tendency is unfortunately perceptible to reject them on the ground of relatively superior qualifications having to be given precedence. This introduces something like the competitive element in its worst form, and we may be permitted to draw your Excellency's attention to the political significance of the monopoly of all official influence by one class. We may also point out in this connection that the efforts of Mohamedan educationists have from the very outset of the education movement among them been strenuously directed towards the development of character, and this, we venture to think, is of greater importance than mere mental alertness in the making of a good public servant.

To understand the exact import of this prayer it would be necessary to glance for a moment at the actual position of the Mahommedan element in the various branches of the public service.

Up to the time of Lord William Bentinck, the philanthropic Governor-General who desired to pull down the Tâj at Agra, the balance between the two great nationalities was fairly even. Perhaps it inclined somewhat in favour of the Mahommedans. The East India Company had obtained from a Mahommedan emperor the functions of collecting the revenue of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa; and, although many changes had been introduced since then in the administration affecting the position of the Mussulmans, the tradition was still maintained that, in view of the compact of 1765, they were entitled to more liberal consideration than any other community. From 1828 the attitude of Government underwent a change. The result was a gradual depletion of the Mussulman element in all branches of the public service open to Indians. In 1871 the proportion of Mahommedans to their Hindu compatriots in what is called the gazetted appointments was less than one-seventh; in 1882 it had fallen below one-tenth!

As regards the lower grades the distribution of State patronage bore an extraordinary character. A few figures taken at random will illustrate this observation. In the Foreign Office staff, consisting of 54 officers, only one was a Mahommedan. The same was the case in the Home Department staff, composed of 63 officers. In the Departments of Finance and Revenue, formed of 75 officers, in the Comptroller-General's office, with a staff of 63 officers, in the office of the Secretary to the Government of Bengal (General and Revenue Department), with a staff of 90 officers of a superior grade, in the Judicial, Political, and Appointment Departments, composed of 82 officers, in the office of the Accountant-General of Bengal, with 181 officers, not a single Mahommedan enjoyed office. In the Board of Revenue, with 113 assistants, only one was a Mahommedan. Similarly in the office of the Inspector-General of Registration in Bengal there was only one. In the Customs Department, with a staff of 130 principal officers and assistants, the Mahommedans were conspicuous by their absence from the muster roll. In the Preventive Department, in the Calcutta Collectorate, in the office of the Director-General of Post-Offices in India there was not a single Mahommedan. In the Postal Department, out of 2,035 officers, only 110 were Mahommedans. In the Telegraph and the Public Works Departments none. Out of 421 officers in the Department of Public Instruction only 38 were Mahommedans. In the High Court of Calcutta, out of 298 officers, only 47; and in the Calcutta Court of Small Causes, out of 27 ministerial officers only one was a Mahommedan.

In the Eastern districts of Bengal—viz. Fureedpore, Pubna, Mymensingh, Rajshahye, Chittagong, Midnapore, Rungpore, &c.—the Mussulman population is considerably larger than the Hindu, in some places forming two-thirds at least of the population. In the Fureedpore

district in 1882 out of a total of 366 Government employes only 30 were Mahommedans. In Mymensingh, out of 344, only 20 were Mussulmans. In Midnapore, out of 499, only 39; in Pubna, out of 205, only 26; in Rajshahye, out of 338, only 57; and in Barisal, out of 423, not more than 36 belonged to the Mussulman community.

Since then English education has advanced by 'leaps and bounds' among the Indian Mahommedans; it would be interesting and edifying to know how, after twenty-one years' working of Lord Dufferin's Resolution, the proportion stands to-day. The official list, which gives the names only of office-holders in the superior grades, is instructive. In the Provincial Service to which appointments are invariably made in India, out of 42 subordinate judges in Bengal, only one, so far as I can see, is a Mahommedan.* Out of 75 deputy magistrates in the first four grades, 13 are Mahommedans. In Eastern Bengal, among the 10 subordinate judges, not one is a Mahommedan; out of 19 deputy magistrates in the second, third, and fourth grades, only one is a Mussulman. In the first grade there is not one.

In 1882, out of 261 munsiffs, who rank below the subordinate judges, 14 were Mahommedans. It may well be asked, Has there been any improvement since then?

In the other presidencies the condition is no better.

In the Bombay Presidency out of 18 subordinate judges of the first class only one is a Mahommedan, and that in Sind, which is largely a Mahommedan province. Similarly one lucky follower of Islam finds a place among 22 deputy collectors in the first four grades. In the Madras Judicial Service, out of 165 appointments, 135 are held by Hindus, 26 by Europeans and Eurasians, and only 2 by Mahommedans. In the Executive Branch, out of 23 incumbents in the first three grades, a solitary Mussulman forms the exception. The *Moslem Patriot* of Madras states that in the 'Salt, Akkari, and Customs Department,' where strength of character is more important than University qualifications, 'out of a total of 1,056 officers, 223 are Europeans, 790 Hindus, and only 43 Mahommedans.' Whilst a Mussulman correspondent in the *Times of India* of the 15th of September points out that out of 225 officers employed in various judicial and executive capacities in the Bombay Presidency only eight are Mahommedans. In the Punjab Provincial Service, out of 44 officers in the first four grades, only 12 are Mahommedans; whilst in the Upper Provinces, out of 44 subordinate judges, only 13 are Mahommedans, and in the Executive Branch of the Provincial Service in the first four grades, out of 51 officers, 16 belong to the Mussulman faith.

Among the 'ministerial staff'—the host of assistants and clerks—the disparity everywhere is still more disheartening.

* In 1882, out of 56 officers, 3 were Mahommedans, 44 Hindus, and 9 Europeans.

With these facts before us we can hardly wonder at the rankling sense of injustice which, it is useless to disguise, pervades the educated classes of Indian Mahommedans. Many of them have by dint of perseverance and industry, acquired the education that has been held out to them as the passport to State employment. Like their more active and 'pushful' compatriots, they entertain the legitimate ambition of sharing in State patronage. Their sentiments naturally affect the feelings of the general body. It is to their credit that they have hitherto abstained from clamour, and so far maintained unshaken loyalty to the British Crown.

A consistent and statesmanlike endeavour, which will not allow itself to be diverted from the pursuit of its object by adverse criticism, to redress the grievances of the classes from whom the public service is, or in the ordinary course would be, recruited, is the only remedy that can satisfy the Mahommedans and restore their confidence in British justice.

This in substance is the prayer of the memorialists. It is neither extravagant nor unfair to any other community. They recognise it is only human nature that men should help relations, friends, and fellow-castemen, and try to hold the door against 'aliens.' The desire for monopoly is not the characteristic of one continent. But they consider it to be the duty of the State to hold the balance, regardless of sectional clamour, with even justice.³

As the first step towards the fulfilment of the promise held out to the Deputation, a complete and exhaustive return should be called for, showing the relative proportion of Mussulman employés, save, perhaps, in the menial grades. The return should be submitted periodically to the Government of India and the Home Government. This would enable the superior and controlling authorities to form an adequate idea of the situation, and to keep an eye on the process of amelioration. Heads of departments should be required to deal personally with the applications, and to see that all classes receive fair play. Vacancies, again, should be notified in the provincial gazettes and local publications, in vernacular and English. Above all, I submit, the rules laid down in Lord Dufferin's Resolution should be strictly enforced.

The allegation of the Mahommedans that the unpopularity of the late Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal was in great measure due to his proclaimed desire to do them justice does not seem to be unwarranted. The avowed organ of the 'National Congress' in London, in commenting on the well-known Lyon Circular, in which certain rules were laid down for the admission of Mahommedans to public offices, had the remarkable heading for its paragraph, 'Religious Test, not Merit'; and now an agitation is said to be on foot to get the Circular rescinded. This, I am afraid, is not the spirit which would win the sympathy of the Mussulmans in Congress enterprises; nor does it appear to be in accord with the *modus vivendi* suggested by one of the Congress journals in Bengal for Mahommedan co-operation. One of the suggestions was that 'in any case they' (i.e. the two communities) 'should never cry out when any undue favour is shown by Government to either of them'!

The memorialists have laid great emphasis on the subject of Mahommedan representation in the Legislative Councils. The functions of these chambers have greatly altered within the last few years; the non-official members have obtained the right of interpellation, which enables them not only to indicate the trend of public opinion, but often to call attention to grievances the ventilation of which otherwise would be left to irresponsible journalists. It has also become the practice for Government, at the conclusion of the Legislative Session, to detail, for the information of the Council, its financial and in some respects its general administrative policy, thus giving the members an opportunity for criticism and comment on the measures proposed. A further 'enlargement' of the Councils and extension of the principle of election, with possibly a widening of their functions, are on the *tapis*. Under these circumstances it is of vital importance to the Mahommedans to be properly represented in the Supreme and Provincial Councils.

The memorialists do not appear to overstate their claim when they say that

in any kind of representation, direct or indirect, [the share accorded to the Mussulman community] should be commensurate, not merely with their numerical strength, but also with their political importance and the value of the contribution they make to the defence of the Empire; and that in this connection due consideration should be given to the position which they occupied in India a little more than a hundred years ago, and of which the traditions have naturally not faded from their minds.

The general interests of the different nationalities of India under British rule are identical, but the Mahommedans have special interests besides; and their claims with regard to these can be represented in a satisfactory manner only by competent men of their own faith enjoying the confidence of the bulk of their people. Hitherto, with very rare exceptions, Mahommedan members have been nominated by Government. Considering the difficulties which surround the task, it must be admitted the selections have, on the whole, been remarkably successful. But it cannot be denied that under the system of nomination the representation of Mahommedans has by no means been adequate. In the Legislative Council of Bengal, if I am not mistaken, there are seven Hindu members to two Mahommedans; in the Legislative Council of the United Provinces five Hindus and two Mahommedans; in the Legislative Council of Bombay, nine Hindus and Parsis and two Mahommedans. In the Madras Legislative Council, out of twenty members eight are Hindus and one a Mahommedan.

The reply of the Viceroy gives the Mahommedans the assurance that in the remodelling of the constitution their claims to proper representation would be fully borne in mind. It is therefore necessary to consider how that object can be best attained. With the

extension of the principle of election, the position of a nominated member could hardly fail to become invidious; his opinions and his vote would be discounted as that of a Government nominee. 'The memorialists have pointed out with conclusive force that, to leave the election of Mahommedan members in the hands of electoral bodies as at present constituted, would reduce the principle to absurdity. The only possible solution—the only means, in fact, of ensuring the proper and fair representation of the Mahommedan element in the Viceregal and Provincial Councils—is by confiding to the several communities the election of their own representatives. Any other system would land the State in confusion and leave the Mahommedans stranded.

Whilst ordinarily the choice of representatives should be left to the two communities separately, the power of nomination should be retained for remedying the balance whenever occasion may arise for its exercise.

The election of members for the Provincial Councils should, I submit, be confided to the following classes of individuals :

(a) Mahommedan members of the district and municipal boards, members of the learned professions, merchants, and persons holding office under Government with an emolument of more than a hundred rupees a month.

(b) Pensioners drawing an allowance of not less than fifty rupees a month.

(c) Persons deriving a permanent income of a hundred rupees a month from house or landed property.

(d) Graduates of the Universities of five years' standing.

(e) Oriental scholars who have held scholarships of fifty rupees a month not otherwise disqualified.

(f) Holders of any title or distinction from Government.

With regard to Mahommedan representation in the Imperial Legislative Council, the memorialists make an important submission. They urge that the proportion of Mahommedan 'representatives should not be determined on the basis of the numerical strength of the community, and that in any case the Mohamedan representatives should never be an ineffective minority.' And they suggest that the election should be entrusted to an electoral body composed of 'Mahommedan landowners, lawyers, merchants, and representatives of other important interests of a status to be determined by Government, Mahommedan members of the Provincial Councils, and Mahommedan Fellows of the Universities.' To my mind it would be simpler, certainly less complicated, to leave the election in the hands of the Mussulman members of the several provincial councils, but the field of selection should not be confined to their own body.

These suggestions are submitted as mere tentative hints for the consideration of the Commission to whom has been confided the task of

devising a practical scheme which would safeguard the interests and satisfy the reasonable aspirations of all communities. In the decision regarding the proportion in which the different elements should be represented, a variety of considerations will naturally enter. At a time when unrest and excitement in one province which has derived the greatest benefit from British rule wears the appearance of developing into strife and disorder, the qualities of self-restraint, of a spirit of compromise and some conception of the limitations to political activity will probably not be overlooked.

The election of members to the Councils does not offer to my mind the same difficulty as that to the District and Local Boards, which, to use the language of the memorialists, form, as it were, 'the initial rungs in the ladder of self-government.' Hitherto Mahommedan representation on these bodies has been to them a constant source of heart-burning. And it will continue to be so until the proportion of members from the two communities is definitely fixed, and the election left to them separately.

The memorialists have put so clearly the case of the Mahommedans as regards representation in the public services, the Councils, and the local bodies, that it may appear somewhat ungracious to call attention to what seems an omission. For there is no allusion in the memorial to the defective administration of the Mahommedan law in the British-Indian Courts of Justice. The appointment of qualified Mahommedans to the High Courts of India is unquestionably a matter of importance; and the memorialists are right in their contention that, having regard to the fact that learned Bengali lawyers sit on the bench in the Punjab Chief Court and the High Court of Allahabad, there is no reason whatsoever against taking a competent Mahommedan from the Punjab or Allahabad to the other provinces, and *vice versa*. Nor ought it to be overlooked that the community of language, sentiment, and traditions places the Mahommedans of the different provinces on a common platform, and constitutes them in an emphatic sense one nationality.

But in my opinion the proper administration of Mahommedan law will not be placed on a satisfactory basis until there is a large increase in the number of Mahommedans in the ranks of the subordinate judiciary.

Twenty-four years ago, in connection with these self-same questions, I ventured to make in the columns of this Review the following remarks :

The depressed and despairing condition of the Mahommedans demands the serious attention of Government, and should not be dealt with longer in the *dilettante* way which has hitherto been the fashion, but in a real earnest manner. A nation consisting of upwards of fifty millions of souls, 'with great traditions, but without a career,' deprived by slow degrees of wealth and influence by a policy of mistaken sentimentalism, mixed with a contemptuous disregard for

popular feelings, must always constitute an important factor in the administration of India. It is this factor which cannot be ignored, and which must be taken into account by Government in all future projects for the well-being of India.⁴

'To-day the most influential organ in the English Press repeats the warning in stronger language :

We have now reached a stage where assurances will be quite valueless unless they are backed by deeds. If the Indian Government does not retain the confidence of loyal minorities by a steady and consistent policy, then, in words recently quoted in our columns, we may expect to see the Mahommedans 'either join the Congress or set up a second agitation of their own.'⁵

The eventual success, however, of the constitutional movement inaugurated by the Deputation rests on the Mussulmans themselves and their prominent men. Occasional and sporadic efforts of this kind will lead to no permanent result. Measures change with men. To watch over the development of the Mahommedan people, to protect their interests, to see that their claims to equitable treatment are not neglected, to work loyally with the Government, and, in a spirit of fairness and compromise, with all other communities in the promotion of the common welfare, they should have permanent and influential associations in every district and in every province acting in conjunction with and under the guidance of a central organisation located in some place like Allyghur, which focuses at this moment the intellectual life and political activity of the Mahommedans of India.

AMEER ALI.

⁴ *A Cry from the Indian Mahommedans*, August 1882. According to the last census, the Mahommedan population directly subject to British rule exceeds sixty-two millions.

⁵ *The Times*, September 26, 1906.

THE PEERS AND THE EDUCATION BILL

WE are approaching the last stage in the consideration of the ill-omened Education Bill. It has already passed through many vicissitudes, and has assumed a shape little like that in which it came forth from the lips of the originator on the night of the first reading in the House of Commons. It has gradually become more hopelessly and inconsistently unjust; but after the weariness of prolonged discussion there are, evidently, comparatively few who desire its absolute rejection, because they are reluctant to enter once again on fresh argument in a matter of which all are growing unutterably weary.

The House of Lords cannot change a Bill which is radically bad and fundamentally unjust into a good measure. The most that the Peers can hope to effect is to soften down some of the most glaring inconsistencies of the Government project, and to work it into such a form that it may last until the country is ready for a rehearing of the whole question. No one, even in the Ministry itself, and least of all the Minister of Education, can imagine that a definite and lasting settlement has been reached, or that the scheme upon which so much of the public energy has been wasted will prove a workable arrangement enduring for any long space of time.

Still at this last moment it may not be amiss to recall once more the points in which the rights of Catholics are violated by the proposals of the Government; those in which Catholics look with confidence to the House of Lords for redress; and those upon which they intend to insist in the future whenever they have an opportunity of asserting their claims.

Catholics have asked, as a matter of right, for Catholic schools for the children of Catholic parents; for Catholic teachers in those schools; and for Catholic oversight of the religious teaching and influence which shall prevail in the schools to be frequented by such children. The first effect of the Bill, as it now stands, would be to destroy by starvation half of our schools. The Government know well that owing to our poverty, and owing to the demands continually made upon us for the building and maintenance of churches, the support of clergy, the foundation and upkeep of numberless institutions of charity, it is simply impossible for us to build, keep in repair,

and maintain the public elementary schools which are needed for our children without our due share of those public funds to which we make our full contribution. Our rural schools and our schools in town districts which are not urban areas are 243 in number—all these are doomed. In the urban areas 254 other schools will be lost, because we are compelled by law to admit Protestant children, whom we have no desire to receive. At least an additional ninety-three schools will be excluded from participation in public aid because there is no Council school in the area. Thus we know for certain that no fewer than 590 out of our 1,056 Catholic schools are in imminent danger of destruction as a result of the proposals of the Liberal Government. A recent and very careful calculation has shown that, owing to the operation of other clauses in the Bill, a total representing eighty per cent. of our schools will be placed in jeopardy.

Next we have no guarantee whatever that our children will be entrusted to the care of Catholic teachers even in the few schools that we are to be allowed to retain. We are told that of course, at first, things will continue as they are at present, and that there is naturally no intention of displacing the teachers who are now employed. Then we are assured that hereafter, when teachers resign or die, Local Authorities are so wise and considerate that they will without doubt appoint Catholic teachers, where there are Catholic children in sufficient number to constitute a Catholic school in the sense in which the Board of Education may be pleased to accept the term. We are given this assurance in face of persistent insistence on the undefined shibboleth, 'No tests for teachers.' What meaning are we really to attach to this cry? If it signifies that no man or woman is to be debarred from entering the teaching profession on account of his or her religious opinions, well and good; we are all agreed. But if it is to be understood that children, whose parents desire that they should receive, day by day in school, definite religious teaching, are to be placed under the care of those who may not be asked whether they believe or do not believe, whether they practise or do not practise, that creed which it will be their duty to impart, then emphatically never was there more misleading nonsense uttered than this parrot-cry, 'No tests for teachers.' And it is the duty of Ministers to tell us definitely what they do mean and what they do not mean, and not to leave the country to vague uncertainties on fundamental questions, or to ask us to put implicit trust in the good intentions of Nonconformist authorities.

Lastly, the unchanging and absolutely consistent attitude of the Catholic Church on the question of religious teaching receives no recognition at all. With us the Bishops are the Divinely appointed guardians of such teaching. It is part of their pastoral duty to prescribe the matter and the manner of the instruction of Catholic children in all that pertains to the faith. This duty they discharge

by the examination of those who are to teach, so that they may be satisfied as to their knowledge and capacity ; by the periodical inspection of the schools ; and by prescribing the catechisms to be taught, and the amount of knowledge to be acquired according to the age of the children. These are things which, according to the discipline and tradition of the Catholic Church, are all of them outside the competence of any lay or civil authority. Yet the intentions of the Government place us in every one of these matters absolutely at the mercy of the Local Authorities, who will be free to usurp functions which are in our eyes necessarily and inalienably attached to the pastoral office.

We look to the House of Lords to do at least four things.

First, the illogical and foolish restriction of the extended facilities, granted under clause 4, to urban areas with a population of over 5,000 is indefensible. Both the limitations in this clause ought to be abolished ; for rights of conscience ought to be respected in all areas, great or small, in the case of those who live in the country as well as of those who dwell in towns. We shall, without admitting for an instant the justice of such an arrangement, be content to maintain our schools in those few places where the Catholic school is the only school in existence ; for therein the Local Authority may feel obliged to provide an alternative school for the children of Protestant parents, although they are only now awaking to this necessity and have been quite content to use our schools in the past. Even in these cases there is no reason that any fair-minded man can assign why we should be deprived of Parliamentary grants if our schools are efficiently maintained ; but this, probably, is a question of finance outside the control of the Upper House.

Next, some means must be devised whereby the parents of the children who attend the school can, in a legal and constitutional manner, give effective utterance of their wishes as to the management of the school and the choice of the teachers who are to be responsible for the teaching imparted in it. This is a matter of vital importance for the reason that our parents will, as a general rule, not be content to send their children to a school unless they can be satisfied that the teachers are really Catholics in spirit and practice, no less than in name and profession. The mere word of the Local Education Committee will have small value in their eyes in a question of this kind. Such provision is also absolutely necessary if grievous wrong is not to be done to our institutes of devoted religious women. These Sisters in hundreds have given their lives to the work of elementary teaching. They have shrunk from no toil or labour or self-sacrifice to fit themselves for their task, to which they devote not a few years only, but their whole working lives. Those who know them, be they Catholic or non-Catholic, and who have been eye-witnesses of their work, will give ready testimony to their merits. Often they are superior to all competitors in their intellectual acquirements, and in the

refinement and culture of their minds. Even when they are less well provided with professional distinction, they are almost invariably deserving of the very highest consideration on account of the high moral influence which they exercise over the children, and the spiritualising power which they are able to exert in the formation of their characters. What is to become of these teachers, of the greatest value in our eyes, and well deserving of special consideration at the hands of the nation? Are they to be thrown out of employment, are their inestimable services to be discarded? This must of necessity be the case if parents are to have no voice at all in the selection of the teachers for our schools. I need not allude to localities where well-known bigotry would most certainly exclude such teachers simply because they wear a distinctive religious dress. For one such instance there will be a hundred where Local Education Committees will fail to retain or to secure the appointment of our Sisters, simply because these authorities are as a rule profoundly ignorant of the great teaching organisations existing in the Catholic Church, and, when they do know of their existence, are often quite unable to appraise their value and merits. A great and glaring injustice, of which, perhaps, Ministers are totally oblivious, will certainly be inflicted on these earnest and most capable teachers, if their chance of appointment is to rest absolutely in the hands of Local Authorities, and our parents are left without a clear, definite, and statutory means of making known their desires in a matter which is to them of the most extreme importance.

Thirdly, the monstrous provision that, as soon as twenty-one per cent. of Protestant children have been placed in our schools, which were not built for them and have no desire to receive them, these unwelcome intruders may claim the right of depriving our Catholic children on many days of the week of the definite religious teaching which their parents desire for them, must be very considerably modified. No one can quite understand how parents are to make their wishes known under the provisions of this part of the Bill; and it is quite possible that the regulations of the ballot may be of such a character as to conceal rather than to declare their real desires. All these matters call for very careful consideration and amendment in the House of Lords.

Lastly, we look to the Peers to make it unmistakably evident that there is to be fair play all round. If any one form of religious teaching is to be provided at the public cost, then alternative forms must be provided in the same manner. If there is to be no such provision for the teaching of the Catholic Catechism, there must be none for the so-called simple Bible Teaching, for Undenominationalism, or for any other indefinite belief. Nonconformists must surely see the justice of this contention. They have declared that they are unable, for conscientious motives, to pay rates for the teaching of the

doctrines of the Church of England or of the Catholic Church. They have been ready to suffer restraint and imprisonment rather than violate their conscience in this respect. They must be well aware that the teaching which they are ready to accept is certainly no whit less abhorrent to us than our teaching is to them. How can they, with any sense of honour or of conscientious consideration, call upon us to do that which on their own principles they must regard as a sinful and immoral act? The promoters of this Bill have in this matter shown themselves shamelessly unjust: they are using two weights and two measures, and they are treating the public funds as though they were the property of Nonconformists only. Rates are taken impartially from Catholics, from Jews, from members of the Church of England and from the adherents of the Nonconformist bodies. With equal impartiality they must be employed in the service of all, without invidious discrimination.

These are the points that we feel justified in urging upon the attention of the House of Lords. If they are taken into account, the Bill will become less flagrantly unjust; but conceived, as it essentially is, to give a preference to those who value indefinite teaching, and to hamper those to whom such teaching is worse than useless, it is incapable of transformation into a completely just measure.

But Governments come and pass, and the fight for justice continues. For thirty-six years we have asked for educational equality. At moments we have approached more nearly to it. Now we are rudely cast back again. We shall not be silent on that account. Concurrent endowment is not the impossibility which the Chief Secretary for Ireland endeavoured to make us believe that it is when he treated the subject in the House of Commons. It is working well in other countries. With a little reasonableness it might work very well in England, and men may come to see that without some system of that nature there will be neither educational peace nor educational progress in our midst. The religious difficulty cannot be abolished by Act of Parliament. It will continue to exist until it is solved by equitable measures. We shall continue to plead that our Catholic schools have a right to be as all other schools; that if the latter are provided or rented by the State, rent must be paid for the former too. In face of the Minister of Education's avowed intentions and public declarations a few months ago, who will ask us to be satisfied with the pitiful surrender of principle on this point, into which he has allowed himself to be forced? But be the struggle long or brief, we shall continue it, as we have done through all the changing years since 1870.

Meanwhile, let his Majesty's Ministers take heed. They are entering on a very perilous path. If they have their way, some five hundred Catholic schools will be closed. In five hundred districts Catholic parents will have to face the alternative of depriving their

children of education, save such as may be given at home or in ill-equipped and poorly-staffed schools, or of entrusting them to those who, on account of their religious belief or non-belief, are unable to command the confidence of Catholic parents. 'Is the law to be put in force against these parents; are they to be compelled, against their will and against their conscience, to send their Catholic children to non-Catholic schools, taught and controlled by non-Catholics? This is the very grave question which in all earnestness I put to the members of the Government. Let them think again before they create a situation which they will ever after most bitterly regret; and let them remember in time that it is a foolish thing to trifle with men's consciences, above all when those consciences belong to Catholics. At the moment of the General Election, in the public discussions since that time in Parliament and outside its walls, we Catholics have treated this question in its true aspect—namely, as one which intimately affects the religious convictions of our people. We have neither used party weapons nor sought party advantages. As far as the Church is concerned, it is absolutely immaterial whether it be eventually settled by this Liberal Government or their Conservative opponents. In our eyes it is a question outside and above all sectional and political differences. There will be an evil day in store for any political party that dares to disregard our united conscientious cry for justice in the treatment of our elementary schools.

✠ FRANCIS, ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

CONVOCATION AND THE 'LETTERS OF BUSINESS'

THE meeting of the Convocation of Canterbury which commences on the 13th of November next will be one of exceptional interest, not only to the ecclesiastical world, but, to a great extent, to everyone in England who finds pleasure in the history of the past. I intend to deal further on with the indifference with which the ordinary layman views this ancient ecclesiastical assembly, and will now mention the two causes which make it of unusual importance to-day, the first being the recent Report of the Royal Commission on Church Discipline, a Report which, to the glad surprise of most people, was a unanimous one, and which Report has strongly recommended the issue of Letters of Business to the Convocations to amend the existing rubrics. The second cause is the composition of the present House of Commons, the great majority of which is unfavourable to the status of the Church of England.

The Government, although it is itself about to issue the Letters of Business, cannot be counted upon as friendly to the Church, and has quite naturally reserved its freedom of action; nor is it certain that, except on a strong case made out, this Parliament will give effect to any proposals likely to improve the Church's position. This has not always been the case when a Liberal Government has been in power; but then, it must be remembered, in all recent Liberal Parliaments the attack on the Church was held back by Mr. Gladstone. The action of the Government is now, however, tantamount to an encouragement to Convocation to proceed on its own course.

There is perhaps no subject in the whole of our constitutional history which has had so much learning, and, to a great extent, it must be confessed, so much contradictory learning, bestowed upon it. Many books, reports, articles, legal opinions, and debates are to be found which are full of controversy as to its origin and its powers. They are rarely looked at now; the newspaper reader finds barely half a dozen columns on Convocation in his daily paper in the whole year; the man in the street knows it only by name, and yet Convocation has existed, substantially in its present form, for more than six

centuries, and in some kindred form for a far longer time still. However, even those most zealous for its antiquity can be content with a pedigree going back to the reign of King Edward the First and the dawn of the English Parliament.

Probably in some shape [said the late Lord Coleridge] it is older than Parliament; certainly in the time of Edward the First and Edward the Second there were attempts made, partially and temporarily successful, to incorporate it into Parliament. The clergy are still summoned in the writs addressed at the beginning of each Parliament to the Archbishops and Bishops of England—and it was the same in Ireland before the disestablishment. . . . The old writ remains as a piece of historical evidence, but the separation of Convocation and Parliament has been complete since the days of Richard the Second, if not of Edward the Third.¹

As is to be supposed, its influence has fallen off with the growth of the Parliamentary power, as did the Canon Law before the Common Law, but in the past on several occasions it has played a signal and useful part in the story of England. When I speak of Convocation, it will be understood that the Convocation of Canterbury is for the most part referred to, for although both Provinces have always had their great council, with co-ordinate privileges, and a certain amount of rivalry as to their (now well-settled) precedence, the history of the York body has by comparison been uneventful.

In early years, when the power wielded by the Church was overwhelming, Convocation had something approaching to legislative power, and a wide freedom in promulgating its canons. It also claimed and exercised the right of taxation and voting subsidies; but these powers were checked in the reign of Henry the Eighth, who was naturally jealous of ecclesiastical power; and by an Act of the twenty-fifth year of his reign, known as the Act of Submission, the authority was taken away from Convocation to 'enact, promulge, and execute' new canons without the King's license having been first obtained, and even then the canons were not to be 'contrariant' to the royal prerogative or the law of England. This was a very important curtailment of their privileges, for without the King they could do nothing, and with the King they could not alter the law. His royal license is not the same thing as the Letters of Business already mentioned, though in certain times in modern history they seem to have been confused, and there is nothing to prevent Letters of Business issuing to discuss a matter generally, and subsequently the license to enact the draft regulations recommended. A royal license, such as is here referred to, was issued by Edward the Sixth, and under it the first Prayer-book, known by his name, was constructed. To be more exact, it was not prepared in, but was approved by, Convocation, and afterwards became law by

¹ Reg. v. Archbishop of York, in the Queen's Bench Division in 1888.

virtue of an Act of Parliament. Three years later the first set of Articles, forty-two in number, were sanctioned by Convocation, and were published by royal authority. Convocation was, of course, at that time in full sympathy with the anti-Roman zeal of the nation, and therefore was not dictating to a jealous rival, but co-operating with an ally.

After the interlude of Queen Mary's reign the process of reformation was resumed, though at the outset Queen Elizabeth peremptorily admonished Convocation not to make any more canons, no doubt because the change of reign would not have at once changed the propensities of the bishops and clergy. The latter, courtier-like, obeyed, though the necessity for a royal license had been taken away by Mary.

A Protestant liturgy was, however, introduced and carried by Parliament on the credit of the learned individuals to whom its preparation had been entrusted, but in this important work Convocation had no share.

In 1562, however, a most important assembly of the body took place, and the present Thirty-nine Articles were agreed to, the last three of the earlier code being dropped. The manner of making these can be read in the Prayer-book itself, and it can be seen that it was easier in those days to alter the liturgy than it is now, as, for instance, it says that if any difficulty arises about the external policy concerning the injunctions, canons, and constitutions, Convocation is to settle them.

I pass to the next great landmark, the year 1603, when James the First called his first Parliament together, and with it, according to the usual custom, his first Convocation. A royal license under the Act of Submission was sent authorising a code of canons and constitutions to be drawn up. Accordingly, the canons known as of that year, or sometimes of 1604, 141 in number, were passed, constituting the principal body of law that for the ensuing centuries has governed the doctrines and administration of the Church. The exact legal effect of these canons has been the subject of endless discussion, a circumstance which illustrates in a remarkable way the uncertainty of English law, which could permit the extent of the validity of such important regulations to be a matter of doubt. The canon law is in use in the Ecclesiastical Courts. Under the Act of Submission the canons of an earlier date are continued if not opposed to the prerogative or the laws of the realm—no doubt a large exception. Some of the canons of 1604 are declaratory of ancient usage, have always been law, and bind the laity. At least two of the canons are mentioned in the rubric as matter to be obeyed, and as the rubric became in 1661 part of an Act of Parliament, these particular canons became law in 1661, if they were not so earlier. With regard, however, to the canons that involved new matter in 1604, and were never

subsequently incorporated into statute, Lord Hardwicke decided in a well-known case that they do not of their own inherent strength bind the laity.²

The next event of importance occurred 'after the Restoration, when Convocation once more intervened with effect. After the general upheaval that had taken place, and the lacuna in the Church's history, and the havoc wrought on it by the Rebellion, a reaction against Puritanism set in with vigour and uniformity rather than elasticity became the rule accordingly. In 1661 Convocation was called upon once more to consider the compilation of a Book of Common Prayer. Again was a royal license given to deal with the question, unfettered this time by any proviso that the changes recommended should not be contrary to the established rules of the Church; in fact, the liturgy was to be revised and made permanent, a by no means difficult task in the exuberantly loyal feeling of the country. The book—i.e., the Prayer-book in its present form—was ultimately agreed upon by Convocation, prelates and clergy signing it; but there is a curious story told of an error almost being made.

Through haste and inadvertence [wrote White Kennett, Bishop of Peterborough] there were some escapes and omissions in the book sent from the Convocations to the Lords. Archbishop Tenison told me by his bedside on Monday, the 12th of February, 1710, that the Convocation book, intended to be the copy confirmed by the Act of Uniformity, had a rash blunder in the *rubric after baptism*, which should have been: *It is certain, by God's Word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved*, but the words *which are baptized* were left out, till Sir Cyril Wycho, coming to see Lord Chancellor Hyde, found the book, brought home by his lordship and lying in his parlour window, even after it had passed the two houses, and happening to cast his eye upon that place, told the Lord Chancellor of that gross omission, who supplied it with his own hand.

To such small accidents are matters of great moment traceable. If this story be true, and the omission had not been noticed, a good deal of controversy would have taken a different course.³ However that may be, the book revised by Convocation was passed by Parliament, and the Act for the purpose has since been known as the Act of Uniformity.

² This is a very debatable matter; it has been usual, when the effect of canons has been altered by Parliament, for Convocation to amend the canons themselves either for conformity or otherwise, as was done after the passing of the Clerical Subscription Act in 1865, and the Act extending the hours of marriage in 1886.

³ It was believed for some considerable time that the original book which had been attached to the Act of Uniformity on this occasion had been lost from the archives of the House of Lords. It was, indeed, missing for some time; but in consequence of a more careful search having been instituted in 1870 by Dr. A. P. Stanley, the Dean of Westminster, the original book has been discovered detached from the Act of Uniformity in the library of the House of Lords, and a facsimile of the book with the MS. revision was made under the authority of the Lords of the Treasury for the use of the Royal Commissioners on Ritual in 1871.—Sir Travers Twiss in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, sub nom. 'Convocation.'

On the Revolution of 1688 being effected, the Government attempted to carry several very comprehensive changes, but found that they could never be passed through the Lower House, which was attached to the Jacobite *régime*, though the Upper House was, on the whole, Whiggish, and inclined to favour William the Third. A full account of this instructive episode, as of many other matters to which I have referred, can be found in the late Mr. Thomas Lathbury's *History of Convocation*, a book of great value, but not very easy to obtain.

Among the changes suggested, it was proposed that chanting should be discontinued, that the Absolution might be read by deacons, that sponsors were to be disused, that the *Gloria* should not follow every psalm, and that the curses in the Athanasian Creed should be declared to be confined to those persons only who deny the substance of Christianity.

Soon after this began the period of internal strife in Convocation which had the effect of bringing its sittings to an abrupt conclusion. There are few controversies more pitiful to peruse than this strange affair. The amount of learning displayed and calumny expended by the disputants during the reigns of William and Anne is something incredible: the turbulent spirit of the time was more active in the clergy than in Parliament; Atterbury was the principal offender, and his brilliant debating ability and overbearing predominance in Convocation, of which he in time became Prolocutor, had virtually the effect of suppressing the body for nearly a century and a half.

At this date it is hardly worth recalling the particulars of the battle of pamphlets, which was waged with so much bitterness; such questions as whether the Archbishop had power to prorogue Convocation by his schedule, and whether Convocation could sit when Parliament was in recess, were good enough battle-grounds for partisans whose real differences were the reflection of the political disputes of the day. Matters culminated in a sermon preached on the 31st of March, 1717, by Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor, who, the year before, had published a pamphlet attacking the non-jurors and defending the Revolution. This sermon would probably have been condemned by the Lower House, and it was with a view of bringing the controversy to a close that Convocation was prorogued, and from that time till the middle of the nineteenth century no royal license was granted to it, and no synodical business was transacted. The body assembled formally from time to time, and was always legally in existence, until some fifty years ago, since which time the meetings have been regularly resumed, and in a very short time after its revival it was called upon to consider a large and fundamental alteration of the Prayer-book as constructed by the Act of Uniformity. But before coming to that point I will briefly refer to the Clerical Subscription Bill of 1865, which was brought in in consequence of the recommendations of a Royal Commission over which the Archbishop of Canterbury

presided. Lord Granville, who introduced the Bill, said the Government had not thought it necessary to consult Convocation, but adduced as an argument in favour of the Bill that the Convocation of York had petitioned the Queen that the Royal 'Commissioners' report might be given effect to. At that time the Church of Ireland was still an established body, and the Archbishop of Dublin moved to postpone the measure till the Irish Convocation had been consulted. This attempt was not successful and the Bill passed, Lord Lyttelton saying that he took for granted that Convocation's assent was necessary to a change of canons, because

though no doubt Parliament, according to the old saying, could do everything except 'turn a man into a woman,' it did not do everything, and one of the things, which it was not likely to do was to alter the canons of the Church without the sanction of Convocation.

Convocation thereupon altered the canons in conformity with the Act.

In February, 1872, in consequence of a report of the Royal Commission which had been appointed in 1869 to inquire into the different interpretations put upon the rubrics, a Letter of Business was sent to the Convocation of Canterbury, authorising it to consider the matters contained in the fourth and final report of the Commissioners. This Letter of Business is objected to by Mr. Wayland Joyce, the author of a useful handbook on the subject, on what certainly seem good grounds. The Letter recited that a royal 'license' had already been issued to the Convocation; now if a license had issued first, and the Letters of Business afterwards, this would have inverted the proper order of things, for the Letter of Business should come first, couched in general terms, and the royal license later on; when the business in hand had been considered and the amending canons agreed upon. The proper order should have been (1) Letter of Business; (2) Royal License under the Act of Henry VIII.; (3) Act of Parliament.

Probably what was referred to as a royal 'license' was only the ordinary writ at the beginning of the existing Convocation, which would have been dated three years earlier, for the Parliament sitting in 1872 was elected at the end of 1868. Mr. Joyce further points out that the Letter of Business was addressed to the Primate instead of to Convocation, a circumstance which will be no doubt considered at the present time.

On that occasion the discussion in Convocation led to legislation, for in consequence of its action the Act of Uniformity which it had helped to pass in 1661 was at length amended, the particular modification being the adoption of a shortened form of Morning and Evening Prayer for daily use, such a form as that now used in our public school chapels and elsewhere. Naturally the intervention of Convocation did not please all the members of that very progressive House of Commons. The preamble of the Bill contained this recital:

And whereas her Majesty was pleased to authorise the Convocations of Canterbury and York to consider the said report of the said Commissioners, and to report to her Majesty thereon, and the said Convocations have accordingly made their first report to her Majesty.

When the Bill stood for third reading, Mr. E. P. Bouverie objected to such a recital, which, he said, had not appeared for 210 years, and he insisted that a minority of the Church wanted to establish the principle that nothing was to be done affecting the property, the dignity, or the interests of the Church without the previous assent of Convocation. This minority, he said, was 'very able, very active, very noisy, and very turbulent.' It is rather remarkable that the only person he mentioned as being or having been a member of this turbulent school was Mr. Keble! He added that the less they had to say to Convocation, and the less they recognised it, the better, and that the alteration of the practice of 200 years was the device, not of Archbishop Tait, but of Mr. Gladstone. The Prime Minister expressed his surprise at its being thought that his office was such a sinecure that he could find leisure to concoct a scheme directed against the freedom of Parliament.

A Church debate would, in those days, have been incomplete without a speech from Mr. Newdegate, who 'could see nothing objectionable in recording the assent of a body whose dissent they could ignore.' It is satisfactory to record that the words were ordered to be retained in the preamble by 160 votes to 89.

The Letter of Business of 1872 was renewed in the same form after the dissolution of 1874 and the election of a House of Commons more favourable to the Church. The legislation of 1872 was a useful but small affair; very long deliberations, however, took place over the wider question of a general revision of the rubrics, deliberations lasting till 1879, of which an account will be found in the evidence of the present Archbishop of Canterbury before the recent Royal Commission. On the 31st July, 1879, the formal reply of the Convocation of Canterbury to the Letter of Business was drawn up and signed, appended to which was a schedule with the changes recommended. The two Convocations did not arrive at identical conclusions, for (among other differences) the northern body wished to retain the Ornaments Rubric unaltered; the southern to enact that priests and deacons must wear a stole or scarf and academic hood, and no other ornaments opposed to the Bishop's monition, with the right to substitute gown for surplice in the pulpit. North and South agreed in not asking Parliament for an Act in the sense of their recommendations until a Bill should have become law enabling the rubric in future to be altered by Order in Council upon the request of both Convocations. A full account of these debates and the phraseology of the reply to the Letter of Business will be found in the Chronicle of Convocation for July, 1879. The outlook in Parliament was not

hopeful, the sixth session of the Disraeli Parliament was running out, and next year Mr. Gladstone was in office with a majority rivalling that of 1868. One of his first Acts—the Burials Act, 1880—modified the Act of Uniformity to the extent of allowing a little latitude in the prayers used at a graveside.

The proceedings of 1874-9 are perhaps the nearest precedent available for the Letters of ~~B~~usiness of to-day. Turning to the procedure to be adopted, it may be safely said that the joint Committee which will be appointed will produce a valuable preliminary report for the benefit of the two ecclesiastical Houses. The appointment of a joint Committee is the usual and common practice on important matters coming up in Convocation; it is appointed by the Archbishop, and, in the Province of Canterbury, the Lower House has twice as many representatives on it as the Upper.

The pressing question will be now to decide the mode of procedure, in order that the sense of the Northern and Southern Provinces may be satisfactorily taken. The inquiry must be a long one, and some way will have to be found of arriving at a decision which will give a good lead for subsequent action. The present Parliament may give way to another more disposed to strengthen the Church, and a report, now shelved, may be utilised in the future.

The Prime Minister has, as has been said, reserved to himself absolute freedom of action. Here, again, it is instructive to quote from Mr. Gladstone in the debate, already referred to, of the 3rd of June, 1872:

All he knew of the Bill had been communicated to him by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Government were not responsible for its origin; but having regard to the mode in which it reached that House, they had thought it right to take charge of the Bill. He must say, further, that he knew of no claim on the part of the clergy to be consulted in these matters. For instance, the Government had legislated pretty stringently upon Church property without waiting for the assent of the clergy. It was a mistake, moreover, to suppose that in framing that Bill an intermediate period between this time and the time of the Act of Uniformity had been overlooked. Since that Act there had been no Bill affecting the services of the Church, or strictly affecting the relations of the clergy to those services, until the Act relating to the Subscriptions of the Clergy. Successive Governments had encouraged the clergy to give their opinion upon this sort of legislation, but the reference to Convocation in the preamble did not bar the power of Parliament to proceed without its assent any more than a reference to a Royal Commission prevented legislation without the approval of the Commissioners. His right hon. friend (Mr. Bouverie) felt probably as he (Mr. Gladstone) did, that the less they had of this ecclesiastical legislation the better; but when it could be shown that it had been that all parties interested desired the steps proposed, it would have been churlish to have refused to assist in passing the measure into law.

Mr. Gladstone must have been mis-reported in *Hansard*, since, apart from the curious idiom in the last sentence, he says in one place that Governments encouraged the clergy to give their opinion upon this

sort of legislation, and in another that the less they had of this ecclesiastical legislation the better. Now Mr. Gladstone's position was unique, for he was the High Church head of a disestablishment party, and on this occasion rendered a very substantial service to the Church. Still, what he exactly meant in decrying ecclesiastical legislation of the kind is not clear: the change sought, a very simple and obviously good one, could have been effected in no other way. Had he suggested delegating general powers for the purpose to Convocation, Mr. Bouverie would certainly not have agreed with him. An Act had been passed in the previous year (1871) for introducing a new Table of Lessons. The assent of Convocation was not recited in the preamble, but could that circumstance have made any difference to the nature or quality of the legislation? And when, two years later, the Public Worship Regulation Bill was being debated in the Commons, he said:

We have a Bill got, I think, asked for by the bishops of the Church. It appears to me that the right hon. gentleman [Mr. Russell Gurney] is under a manifest misapprehension on that point. It is true that the bishops generally voted for the second reading, but the Bill has undergone radical changes since the second reading. As it comes to us it has been manufactured, not by the two Primates, but by members of Parliament independent of them. Still it was in the first instance proposed, and has since been supported, by the two Primates. I have asked whether we ought not, when a Bill of this kind has proceeded from such a quarter, to show a readiness to sacrifice a good deal in order to give our assent to it. I am one of those who believe that it is not possible to deal with ecclesiastical legislation under the conditions of the existence of modern Parliaments except by the assistance of authority brought to bear on the proposals that are made. I have always looked to the concurrence of the Government and the heads of the Church as the essential condition of a satisfactory solution of ecclesiastical problems.

While the Bill had been passing through the Lords, the Committee of Convocation had reported with regret that they could not recommend the legislation proposed, so that Mr. Gladstone's language probably meant that one ground of his opposition was that Convocation had not expressed itself in its favour, though this is hardly consistent with what he said in 1872 to the effect that

he knew of no claim on the part of the clergy to be consulted in these matters.

The tide in favour of the Bill, however, rose steadily in the House of Commons, and the second reading was carried without a division.

I have spoken of the indifference shown to Convocation, but in addition to this it has to encounter a constant and unreasoning dislike, and advanced Liberal politicians are fond of taking all opportunities to belittle and decry it. To Mr. Gladstone's mind, with his enthusiastic High Church ideals and his eighteen-year representation of the University of Oxford, Convocation would present itself as a stately body well qualified to deal with the matters coming properly within its sphere, and one to which, on Church matters, an

active politician would do well to look for guidance. His successors will hardly be so reverent ; still even this Parliament cannot refuse—so long as the Establishment remains—to consider a scheme of reform, if the Church can show a virtual unity in its favour. Lord Cross once said at a meeting of the Representative Church Council that as Secretary of State he had been in the habit of taking charge of Church Bills, only when the Church was agreed within itself in support of them. On the present occasion the chances of such a unanimity being found are by no means hopeless. The very representative Royal Commissioners with the assistance of the Archbishop of Canterbury were able to agree, and this happy result may be repeated after the discussions in Convocation.

In one respect Convocation is at a disadvantage. It is not possible in a few words adequately to consider one salient feature of it—namely, the disproportion between *ex-officio* and elective members in the composition of the Lower House. In an ordinary diocese, dean and archdeacons sit as of right ; in addition the cathedral chapter has one representative, and the bulk of the clergy only two. To take an extreme case, that of London, the bishop sits in one House, while in the other are the deans of St. Paul's and of Westminster, the archdeacons of London, Middlesex, and Westminster, one representative (Canon Newbolt) for the St. Paul's Chapter, another (Canon Henson) for the Westminster Chapter, two proctors only (Prebendaries Ingram and Villiers) represent the entire clergy in the diocese, and the unbeneficed clergy have no voice in their election. Such a disparity in representation—and it has existed so from time immemorial—cannot be without its effect on the zeal of the body constituent. When this is remedied (and Bills have in former years been brought in for the purpose), a good deal of the ground from under the feet of Convocation's critics will have been cut away.

HUGH R. E. CHILDERS,

Actuary of the Convocation of Canterbury.

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CONVOCATIONS

WHAT ails the Government that they should have issued Letters of Business to Convocation? Many of their supporters are Nonconformists, who do not even know what Convocation is. Many more call themselves Agnostics, and regard it as a quaint survival of obsolete mediævalism. To the laity of the Church of England, most of whom are Liberals, the very existence of Convocation is a standing insult. In the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland ministers and lay elders sit side by side. For the Convocations of Canterbury and York no layman has even a vote. Nor does that practical paradox exhaust the absurdity of the situation. For a clerk in holy orders cannot exercise this exclusively clerical franchise unless he possesses a benefice, commonly called a living. Thousands of curates are thus shut out, as well as many learned professors, tutors in the universities, and masters in the public schools. Each Convocation has two Houses. The Upper House consists of the diocesan bishops; the Lower House contains deans, representatives of cathedral chapters, and proctors for the beneficed clergy. In the province of Canterbury there are only two proctors for each diocese; in the province of York there are two for an archdeaconry. In the province of York the two Houses sit together; in the province of Canterbury, where there are three times as many bishops, they sit separately. In no case, and for no purpose, can the two Convocations unite. The 'Houses of Laymen,' so called, have no legal status, but rather are repugnant to the law of the land. They are very modern inventions, mere shams and make-believes. Convocation itself is historically interesting, and has a respectable antiquity. According to Bishop Stubbs, 'the Convocations of the two provinces, as the recognised constitutional assemblies of the English clergy, have undergone, except in the removal of the monastic members, at the dissolution of the monasteries, no change of organisation from the reign of Edward the First down to the present day.' They were once an estate of the realm, claiming and enjoying the right to tax themselves. This power, Hallam tells us, they surrendered in the reign of Charles the Second, and obtained in return the privilege of

voting at Parliamentary elections, though not of sitting in the House of Commons. The first estate of the realm is now the Lords Spiritual, being those bishops who have seats in the House of Peers. Convocation cannot meet without the leave of the Crown, and that leave was withheld from 1717 till 1854. It was not, however, till 1861 that the annual sittings of Convocation became regular, and, so far as I am aware, they have not since done anything by their own authority, except to repeal the canon which 'prevented parents from acting as sponsors at the baptism of their own children. This was no doubt within their jurisdiction. For the canons are only binding upon the clergy, and can therefore be modified by Convocation with the assent of the Crown.

It is understood that the Prime Minister has issued these Letters of Business for the purpose of allowing the Convocations to discuss Lord St. Aldwyn's, or Sir Lewis Dibdin's, Report on Disorders in the Church. He did so at the request of the archbishops, and the Archbishop of Canterbury has announced that the Convocation of his province will meet on the 20th of November. What then? The Royal Commission recommended that certain changes should be made in the ecclesiastical law. But there is no constitutional difference in this country between ecclesiastical law and any other. Law is law, and can only be made by Parliament, as it can only be declared by judges. Sir Robert Finlay takes it upon himself to say that the decision of the Court of Appeal in the *West Riding* case is wrong. Many quite obscure clergymen say the same thing about the judgment of the Privy Council in *Clifton v. Ridsdale*. But it makes no difference. The legal position is what they say it is not. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman very wisely told the archbishops that the Government could not be bound by what Convocation said or did. Then why call it together? A man must have taken leave of his senses before he could think that the present House of Commons would care two straws for Convocation. And the House of Commons is the one body which can represent the established, Erastian Church of England as a whole. In the debate on the second reading of the Education Bill Mr. Healy, who is a Catholic, amused the House by describing the original Act of Uniformity, with the Book of Common Prayer in the schedule, and the amendments introduced in Committee underlined. 'That, Mr. Speaker,' said he, 'is religion in the making.' Caustic as this sarcasm may be, it is only the literal fact. The Church of England is a Parliamentary Church, and no amount of episcopal contradiction from the red benches of the Lords can make it otherwise. If, for instance, the Ornaments Rubric is to be altered, and if sacramental vestments are to be legalised, Parliament must legalise them. Convocation can no more do it than it can repeal the Act of Uniformity, which the Royal Commission considers too rigid for modern times. And observe, if one rubric is modified, every

rubric may be expunged, every creed may be removed, the Ten Commandments themselves may be struck out of the public service. Are the Cabinet really prepared, at the bidding of Convocation, to go into Committee of the whole House on the Prayer-book and all that it contains? The question answers itself. But then we come back to the other question, which seems to me unanswerable, Why have his Majesty's Ministers consulted Convocation at all? Of course, I know that that process is advised in the Report of the Commissioners. But, in the first place, no such document is binding on any Administration; and, in the second place, a good deal has happened since the Ritual Commission was appointed. When Mr. Balfour appointed it, he had a large majority in the House of Commons. In this House of Commons he is always sure of a patient hearing, but he is sure of nothing else. Not one member of Parliament in ten, scarcely one in twenty, cares what the opinions of the Commissioners are or were. The evidence is quite another thing. As I tried to show in a previous article, the witnesses, especially those of them who were High Churchmen, proved clearly enough that the Protestant Church of England comprises thousands of clergymen who are not Protestants at all, who hate the Reformation, who deny that the King is over all persons and over all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, within these his dominions supreme. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of that fact. But the issues which it raises are such as it would be positively childish to lay before a body like Convocation. Lord Halifax quoted at the Church Congress last month from the anonymous pamphlet of a High Churchman that the Reformation was a thing to be repented of in ashes and tears. This fanatic might be treated with the contempt it deserves. What demands the attention of the Cabinet and of Parliament is the testimony, unshaken in cross-examination, that the open Bible and the right of private judgment, the independence of the laity, and the subordination of the Church to the State are unblushingly denied by bishops as well as clergymen, salaried officers of a State Church. Is Convocation to be asked whether England shall remain a Protestant country? If it replied in the negative, would it affect the opinion of any man, woman, or child?

The bishops have been, in vulgar language, giving themselves away. Whatever else may be said of the Education Bill, it is at least a Protestant measure. The religious teaching for which it provides in elementary schools is the simple Christianity of the New Testament which all Protestant Churches, including the Church of England, regard as alike necessary and sufficient for children of tender years. The vast majority of lay Churchmen agree on this vital point with the vast majority of Nonconformists. Yet the bishops, with a few distinguished exceptions, have denounced this truly religious system as 'worse than heathendom.' The Bishop of

Birmingham would rather have the children of 'Agnostics' taught 'Agnosticism' at the public expense than let the religion of Christ be included in the curriculum of elementary schools. 'Down with the Bible, up with the priest,' is the war-cry of the new sacerdotalism.

The President of the Church Congress this year was, as it happened, the Bishop of Carlisle, a sound Protestant, who delivered an excellent address. Though not a Liberal in the party sense, the Bishop of Carlisle, like the Bishop of Ripon and the Bishop of Sodor and Man, perceives that blind opposition to the faith of their fellow-countrymen is a suicidal policy for the Episcopal Bench. The Bishop of Hereford is a Liberal in every sense, and therefore I do not quote him. For ten years the late Government stuffed and packed the high places of the Church with their political partisans. But when prelates identify themselves with a party, their prelacy is near its end. And these prelates put their money on the wrong horse. They thought the Tories were in for ever, so that they themselves might eat, drink, and be merry at the expense of their Nonconformist brethren. They were not prepared for the rising of the people, and they neglected the warning of their own Nestor, who told them that they were on a slippery slope. Power has passed from them, and the laity propose, with or without their permission, to manage the affairs of the Church. While the Convocations talk, the Government will have to make up their minds. They may of course determine to do nothing at all, and let the evidence published by the Commission sink into the popular mind. The Church Congress indulged in amiable futilities, and asked without answering why the masses did not go to church. The Bishop of Oxford, studiously puffed by the *Times*, has since been endeavouring in a series of charges, or a charge of many series, to explain what the Commission has done. It seems that his lordship attended every meeting of the Commissioners, and therefore, according to the *Times*, he must know. He has not, however, the gift of lucid exposition, and his meaning is not clear. He is a brilliant scholar, and was a popular don. But unfortunately, perhaps from want of parochial experience, perhaps from a deficiency of backbone, he cannot manage his own diocese. The beautiful church of Dorchester, within ten miles of Oxford, has been emptied by Ritualism, and the state of Headington, which is still nearer to that seat of learning, has long been scandalous. Ἰατρός ἄλλων, αὐτὸς ἔλκεσι βρώων, the Bishop of Oxford is about the worst man the *Times* could have chosen for its adulatory homage. The Dean of Canterbury is really better, with his amiable belief in taking what you like from the practices of the sixth century, omitting what seems unsuitable and adding what appears to be required. If it were not for the ruthless criticism to which the sixth century was submitted in the evidence of the Dean of Christ Church, affectionate partiality might describe it as a sure, or at least plausible, refuge. Now these deans love one another.

An instructive episode of the present Session seems to have escaped public notice. The first place in the ballot for Bills was won by Mr. Carlile, Member for the St. Albans Division of Hertfordshire, which includes Hatfield House. Mr. Carlile utilised his opportunity for the second reading of a Church Discipline Bill, which he put down on a Friday in May. Mr. Masterman gave notice of an amendment declaring that the only remedy for disorders in the Church was disestablishment, and thereupon Mr. Carlile withdrew his Bill. Later in the year, Mr. Austin Taylor, who represents the Protestantism of Liverpool, reintroduced his old Bill to abolish the episcopal veto on ecclesiastical prosecutions, and to substitute deprivation for imprisonment. This is the easiest and simplest method of dealing with Ritualism by legislation. There is a great deal to be said for it, and it stops far short of the policy which the Church Association would adopt. But either Mr. Masterman, himself a Churchman, or somebody else, would meet it with a similar amendment, the amendment would be carried by a large majority, and the Bill would be destroyed. The Government could, I suppose, carry the Bill. They could carry anything. But to deprive three thousand incumbents of their tithes and glebes would be a less easy and a far less agreeable process than the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. To that complexion we must come. The bishops have challenged the State, and the alternative is episcopal or Parliamentary rule. There is no possible escape from this dilemma. The Bishop of Oxford thinks that his clergy ought to be guided by a Commission on which he sat. That both he and they ought to obey the law does not strike him as a relevant proposition. The old-fashioned bishop may not have magnified his office as his modern successors do. But he was at least loyal to the Crown and State from whom his powers were derived. The bishop of the twentieth century wants to have it both ways. He wishes to retain his revenues, and his seat in the House of Lords, while at the same time he usurps a spiritual independence quite incompatible with his Erastian dignity, as it is wholly foreign to the discipline of Rome. When Bishop Creighton was a country clergyman, he never read the Athanasian Creed. After he had been raised or lowered to the Bench a rector asked him if he was bound to read it. 'The law is binding both upon you and upon me' was the curt reply. It may not have been consistent, but it was at least intelligible. Who can make head or tail of the Bishop of Oxford's views about vestments?

One thing, a very simple thing, Convocation may as well understand before it meets. The people of this country, including the laity of the Church, expect that the clergy of the Establishment shall obey the law of the land, as interpreted in the King's Courts by his Majesty's judges. The Ritualists cannot shelter themselves behind the passive resisters. Passive resisters are not established or endowed.

On one great and famous occasion, the bishops of the Church of England earned the enthusiastic support of a Protestant nation by their noble stand for law and liberty against the lawless despotism of a Catholic Sovereign. The acquittal of the seven bishops was the signal for the Revolution of 1688, though five of them afterwards illogically refused the oath of allegiance to William the Third. The law triumphed in their exculpation. It triumphed again when Sancroft was removed from Lambeth because he would not acknowledge the authority of Parliament. His successor, Tillotson, represented the victory of Erastianism, between which and the voluntary system there is no half-way house. The Scots are a peculiar people, with their own laws and institutions, and High Churchmen deny that their Established Kirk is a Church at all. English ingenuity has not yet discovered, and is not likely to discover, any escape from the alternative of endowed Erastianism and disendowed independence. Mr. Gladstone, who hated Erastianism, saw that fact quite clearly, and was in principle opposed to establishment altogether. Ordinary Englishmen care very little about logic, and in 1902 the question of disestablishment was so completely dormant that it seemed to be dead. Mr. Balfour, a Presbyterian on one side of the border, and an Anglican on the other, listened to the voice of Convocation, and put the Church on the rates. That error, serious as it was, might have been sufficiently cured by the Education Bill of 1906, which makes the receipt of rates dependent upon popular control. The evidence taken by the Ritual Commission cannot be so easily disposed of. It has brought matters to a crisis, which can be neither ignored nor postponed. The Report of the Commissioners is waste paper, except in so far as it proposes the abrogation of the episcopal veto. The facts revealed by the witnesses, on the other hand, are not to be explained away. Roman Catholics regard them with unconcealed amusement and delight. Amusement and contempt are the mildest feelings which they excite in the minds of Protestants. The protagonists of the Establishment now are those cynics who feel, with Charles Buller, that it is the only thing which stands between them and true religion. A few old-fashioned High Churchmen, who have never indulged in any ritual extravagance, may cling to the idea that ecclesiastical law can be enforced by ecclesiastical tribunals. A few old-fashioned Low Churchmen may think that, more fortunate than Lord Penzance, they can put Ritualism down. There are Broad Churchmen, not a few, whose natural Conservatism shrinks from cutting the painter, and who dread the ascendancy of sacerdotalism unrestrained by the courts. But the general public, Conformist or Nonconformist, will not tolerate the crafty Romanisers whom the Bishop of Southwark calls faithful and loyal men. If the use of incense, altar-lights, and sacramental vestments were generally

dropped in parish churches, the agitation might subside. But everybody knows that that will not happen, and the Bishop of Oxford's soft sawder is no substitute whatever. The evil is too deeply seated for anything but a radical cure. Once the Church were severed from the State, public responsibility would be at an end, Dissenters would have no further voice in the matter, and the Church itself could deal with its own Ritualists as it chose. There is not much Ritualism in Ireland. So long as the Church is established, Dissenters have as much right to control its policy as Churchmen themselves, and Dissenters are Protestants to a man. The bishops, or most of them, are up in a balloon. They judge of the laity by the sort of people they see at Church Congresses and Diocesan Conferences. Perhaps they may find that the House of Lords, Conservative as it is, contains a few men of the world. The Bishop of Manchester, who has not yet been admitted to that Assembly, and cannot, therefore, move the 'amendments' to the Education Bill of which he has been pleased to give notice, made a desperate effort to carry Manchester for the Tories at the General Election. He did so on the express ground that the Liberals would interfere with sectarian education at the public expense, and the result we see. He now consoles himself with demonstrations which demonstrate nothing, and processions which proceed nowhither. There is no demonstration like the evidence of the Blue-book in four volumes, and the procession of the bishops has disestablishment for its goal. 'I am supposed to be a sort of a Churchman myself,' said Mr. Gladstone once, 'but they never ask me to join a Church Defence Institution.' Mr. Gladstone was a Churchman of the religious sort. When the bishops talk about dogma, they mean money. There is nothing to prevent them from teaching their own dogmas at their own expense. But there are very strong reasons why they, drawing their incomes from funds vested by Parliament in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, should not allow the churches of the Establishment to be used for 'the Mass in English.' If people want a Catholic ritual, they should join the Church of Rome, and see how far they are permitted to do what they like there. Some of the bishops would like to drive every Protestant out of the Church. The law prevents them from doing that; and if the law did not, the laity would. The Church of England is meant for Protestants, and for Protestants only, as Archbishop Laud knew very well, and the present Archbishop of Canterbury, the disciple of Tait, knows still better. The Bishop of Southwark, the Bishop of Oxford, and the Bishop of Birmingham would burn Protestants at the stake, if they had the power, and were not kind-hearted men. They have a perfect right to their opinions, and they may consider the Reformation, if they please, a calamitous disaster. But, inasmuch as the English people take a precisely opposite view, the plea for continued maintenance of the

Establishment becomes untenable in reason or logic. Until the evidence heard in private by the Royal Commission had been printed, and laid before the public, it was possible, though it was getting more and more difficult, to treat the performances of the Ritualist clergy as vagaries of eccentric individuals. It is quite impossible now. Thousands of clergymen are proved to be habitually violating the law, and the bishops are content with futile remonstrance. These clergymen claim that they are a law to themselves. Episcopal monitions are uncanonical. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a usurpation. The Court of Arches has no moral authority, because it is bound by the decisions of the Judicial Committee. The laity have no right to interfere with ecclesiastical matters at all. What the clergy assumed in the reign of Henry the Eighth they assume in the reign of Edward the Seventh. But now as then, the secular power will insist upon being supreme. Then it was the Crown. Now it is Parliament. The principle is the same. The word 'minister' means servant, not master, and the masters are not the clergy, but the people of England.

The gist of the Education Bill is that national funds are not to be abused for sectarian purposes. But the property managed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners is just as national as the rates. So are the tithes, which are a charge upon land, and the glebes, which are commuted tithes. When the Ecclesiastical Commissioners pay the Bishop of Southwark his salary, they pay it to a man who abhors Protestantism, the religion of the country, and glories in the name of Catholic. If there is a Catholic Church since the Reformation, it is the Church of Rome, and even the most Conservative Erastian, or the most Erastian Conservative, does not desire to see a branch of the Roman Church established in England. If the Bishop of Southwark and the Bishop of Birmingham were merely Dr. Talbot and Dr. Gore, they could repudiate Protestantism to their hearts' content. No Protestant would care twopence. But it is a grave abuse of their position as Lords Spiritual, Peers of Parliament, that they should disown the faith of their fellow-citizens. I took up the other day a very interesting and a very well written book by Dr. Bigg, a Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford. Professor Bigg says plainly that there is no guide to Christian truth except the Bible, interpreted by human knowledge and human wisdom. That is Protestantism. That is the religion of the Church of England. How many bishops, how many clergymen, would accept it? How many laymen outside the Cecil family would reject it? I could answer the second question if I knew the lay membership of the English Church Union. The Bishop of Lincoln has had the courage openly to join that body, which repents of the Reformation in ashes and tears. A good many of his lordship's colleagues, less courageous

than his lordship, share his opinions without proclaiming them. In what respect they differ from Roman Catholicism I am not theologian enough to determine. But the difference, or rather the distinction, is technical, not substantial, except in so far as it consists of a dislike even for Papal authority. If I had been a member of the Royal Commission, I would have asked every bishop who came before it the simple question, 'Is your lordship a Protestant?' The replies would have been very interesting, and most of them would have been very long. So far as the clergy are concerned, the Church of England has ceased to be a Protestant Church. So far as the laity are concerned, it is as Protestant as ever it was. There is the case for disestablishment in a nutshell. The clergy claim to be the sole interpreters of the Bible. The laity deny their claim. The clergy say that the Holy Communion is the sacrifice of the Mass. The laity say that it is not. Of course there are exceptions on both sides. But such is the general rule, and it can only lead to one result. The old-fashioned clergyman was a minister of the Gospel. The newfangled clergyman is a priest of the Holy Catholic Church, and the English people have no use for priests. When Manning joined the Church of Rome, he found, to his great annoyance, that he was no longer an archdeacon, only a layman, and that the Pope could see no distinction between an Anglican priest and a Protestant Dissenter. It is strange that Manning should have been surprised. The existence of two Catholic Churches is an absurdity, though Christian Churches may well be numerous, as they are.

If the Government hope to escape responsibility by throwing it upon Convocation, they are doomed to disappointment. For the Established Church of this country they, as Ministers of the Crown, are alone responsible to the House of Commons. Unless they are prepared to sever the connection between Church and State, not merely in Wales but in England too, they are bound to prevent the endowment of Romanism. The differences between Protestant communions are, except in the eyes of bishops, immaterial. Between Protestant and Catholic there is a great gulf fixed. Catholic disabilities have been, with a very few exceptions, most properly removed by Parliament. But Catholicism within the Establishment is a scandalous and indecent anomaly. Experience since 1870 has shown that there is a sound and complete form of religious education for the young which satisfies the requirements of all Protestant Christians. It has proved impossible to find any such common ground for Protestants and Catholics, whence the necessity for the fourth clause of the Education Bill. It is probable that, if the Church were disestablished, Anglo-Catholics, as they call themselves, would go over to Rome, and the vast majority of Protestant Churchmen, while preserving their noble liturgy, would find very little to separate them from

the other Protestant denominations. But that is a dream of the future. The duty of lay Churchmen at the present time is to make it quite clear, not through Convocation but through Parliament, that the Church of England, always has been, and always will be, faithful to the principles of Latimer and Ridley. The Oxford Movement has spent itself, and the Bishops are walking in a dream.

HERBERT PAUL.

*The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY cannot undertake
to return unaccepted MSS.*

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
AND AFTER



No. CCCLVIII—DECEMBER 1906

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE LORDS

THE title which is most proudly borne by the present majority in the House of Commons is that of the Party of Progress, nor will anyone be disposed to deny their right to it, if 'progress' be construed in the broad sense of moving from one point in space to another. Ministers, in frantic eagerness to secure support from the tail of their party, have abandoned positions which, within the present year, they pledged themselves solemnly, in Parliament and out of it, never to surrender.¹ Principles, revered as cardinal from the very dawn of our Constitution—sanctity of free contract, equality of justice for men of all classes, taxation as warrant for representation—have been swept by this Administration into a dishonoured limbo as impediments to sheer speed; and in their place we are served with shameless pandering to the claims of organised labour, crude plans for redistribution of

¹ See, on the Trade Disputes Bill, Mr. Haldane to his future constituents on the 22nd of January 1906, and the Attorney-General in the House of Commons on the 28th of March 1906. Fidelity to pledges three years old is scarcely to be expected, and Mr. Asquith's bold words on the 6th of February 1903 are ancient history.

agricultural land, and a scheme of disfranchisement which will gratify the 'have-nots' by diminishing the voting power of the 'haves.'

Progress! aye, plenty of it, but where must such Rake's Progress inevitably land the community, unless some restraining power be applied? The motor-man, proceeding at a higher speed than some of the passengers consider consistent with safety, may moderate it in either or both of two ways; he may throttle up and throw his engine out of clutch, or he may apply the brakes. If he does the second without doing the first, the result is friction, violent strain and more or less injury to his car. Applying this imperfect metaphor to the present legislative situation, there appears little prospect of the gas being shut off. The majority in the House of Commons at the back of the Government is too exuberant, too menacing; Ministers cannot take out the clutch if they would. The wayside spectator perceives no way out of impending disaster but a vigorous application of brake power. It is a force which nobody would wish to see exerted to resist engine power, but there arise circumstances when it is the only expedient in a dilemma. It is the old story—*nec deus intersit*—and it is in the firm belief that we have to deal with *dignus vindice nodus* that the following lines are penned.

The controlling force rests with the House of Lords, and one is unwilling to doubt that they are prepared to apply it. It is scarcely conceivable that *oi ἀριστοι*—the best of their kind and therefore the bravest (for that is the bedrock meaning of the word)—will prove so apprehensive of consequences as to shrink from exerting the power with which the Constitution has invested them—from rising to that responsibility which is the sole justification for their exaltation above their fellow-citizens. If the Peers should stifle their own clear convictions upon the principles of measures now, or about to be, under their consideration—if they should consent to pass legislation well knowing it to be unjust—were they to do these things from fear of the terrible results to their own position loudly reiterated by the Lloyd-Georges and Keir Hardies—then indeed the nation would know what to think of them. It would recognise in the Upper Chamber of Parliament a House of Shams—a club of gentlemen distinguished among persons of similar means only by the possession of ornamental titles, which secure for them 'salutations in the market-places, the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts.' These social advantages the nation never has grudged them. On the contrary, they have been cheerfully accorded in recognition of the high and onerous functions which the House of Lords was constituted to perform, and which history is there to prove that they have never yet failed to perform. Crisis after crisis has arisen and been encountered by the Upper Chamber in calm, firm and well-considered manner; progress has been regulated, but never unduly hindered; let the social development of the nineteenth century testify to that. Collision

between the two Houses has been frequently predicted, and occasionally, as in 1832, appeared imminent and inevitable; but it has always been averted, either, as in 1832, by the Lords recognising the will of the nation as reiterated at the polls; or, as in 1893, by the nation repudiating at the polls the policy of those whom it had entrusted with temporary power.

That being the spirit and manner in which the Lords hitherto have discharged their part as *οἱ ἀριστοί*, will they flinch now from the responsibility thrown upon a Second Chamber? Do they fully realise by what a large, if latent, force of public opinion they are supported as an indispensable bulwark of the Imperial structure? Despite the imperfection inherent in a hereditary Chamber of Legislature and its apparent inconsistency with a democratic constitution, the House of Lords has earned by tradition and retained by its actions a character for breadth of view, maturity of judgment and moderation of counsel, whereby the earnestness, and especially the permanence, of popular requirements may be tested before they are conceded. It is its chief function to secure a hearing, not for every passing gust of the *popularis aura*, but for the general and permanent trend of opinion in the nation.

At this very present juncture there comes a trenchant illustration of the transient character of some of these gusts. In 1903 the result of municipal elections in London and the provincial boroughs was the return of a sweeping Radical and Progressive majority. The municipal electorate, as a whole, declared in favour of lavish expenditure and socialistic schemes. As there is no Second Chamber to revise the measures of Municipal Councils, the majority had a perfectly free hand, and set honestly to work to fulfil 'the mandate' on which they had been returned.

How fleeting that mandate has proved to be! Three years of 'progressive' management of their concerns have sufficed to convince the electors that it was not at all the kind of administration which they approved. The overturn at the Parliamentary elections in January was not more startling than that of the municipal elections in November, only the position of the two parties in each is reversed.

The returns from the provincial boroughs are not complete at the time of writing, but the relative position of parties in the London boroughs is as follows:

	1903.	1906.
Boroughs with Municipal Reform majorities	13	26
Boroughs with Progressive majorities	15	2
Councillors elected (excluding Hampstead and Stoke Newington)—		
Municipal Reformers	600	996
Progressives, Socialists, &c.	690	294
Average percentage of votes polled	47·3	50

This result is the more remarkable, inasmuch as municipal elections

all take place on the same day. The reflex effect upon one constituency of victory or defeat in another, which so notoriously accelerates the 'swinging pendulum in Parliamentary elections, is no factor in the voice of the boroughs.' Municipal elections as a whole, making due allowance for local peculiarities, declare the mind of the voters at the moment with far greater precision than can be expressed in a general election for Parliament as conducted under present regulations.

Having regard, then, to the emphatic revocation in 1906 of the mandate issued by the municipal electors in 1903, who shall affirm that, were the life of the present Parliament limited to three years, the mandate assumed to have been issued to the House of Commons in the present year might not be revoked with equal emphasis in 1909 ?

Well, we have septennial, not triennial, Parliaments, and, with a Radical Administration in power, we hear no more about the iniquity of the septennial arrangement burking the expression of the national will. Every Minister and member is busy interpreting 'the mandate' according to his favourite doctrine or prepossession; one man maintaining that it was issued against denominational education; another focussing it upon yellow labour; the Duke of Devonshire and his Free Trade Unionists proclaiming it as the knell of Tariff Reform, while Labour representatives construe it as a decree conferring unexampled privilege upon trade unions. The one thing clear to any critical mind is that, in whatever degree one or other of these subjects may have dominated opinion in different constituencies, certainly they could not have been concluded in one definite 'mandate' by the nation. In Lancashire, for instance, the recent result of the municipal elections is attributable mainly to dissatisfaction with the Education Bill; whereas, on the very eve of these elections, Mr. Lloyd-George proclaimed at Spalding that 'there is a clear mandate by the country in relation to the matter' (*i.e.* the Education Bill), 'and yet the House of Lords, which is responsible to nobody, seeks to override the decision of men whom the nation has chosen to do its work.'

The House of Lords has never yet done anything of the kind, nor is there the slightest fear of their doing so now. Nevertheless, the necessity is urgent that they should do so, times without number, they have done before—namely, give the nation an opportunity of pronouncing upon the kind of work its representatives are doing, and of indicating whether it desires that such work should go on.

Judging from the extra-parliamentary speeches of certain members of the present Government, the two Chambers of Legislature are on the brink of war, unless the House of Lords should beat the *chamade*. It can scarcely be premature, then, to attempt a forecast of the forces on either side and the probable course of the campaign. It so happens that the choice of a battle-field, which is usually dictated by the House of Commons, as the more aggressive combatant, rests on this occasion

with the House of Lords. There are no fewer than five Bills sent up, or about to be sent up, to be dealt with by them, upon any of which the issue may be taken :

- (1) The Education Bill. .
- (2) The Plural Voting Bill.
- (3) The Trade Disputes Bill. .
- (4) The Land Tenure Bill ; and
- (5) The Small Holdings (Scotland) Bill.

If we regard the last two of these Bills as one measure, seeing that they both deal with land-tenure in the direction of voiding contracts and establishing dual ownership, there remain four positions, upon any one of which the Lords may make a determined stand and demand the sense of the nation.

As to the Education Bill—enough said. Whatever changes the Lords have made or may yet make in it, it is not over that *corpus* that the final conflict will be waged. When the leader of the House of Lords is found voting against his colleagues in the Cabinet in favour of an amendment moved and supported by the Opposition, it is clear that, whatever driving power they derive from the House of Commons, the Government cannot insist upon the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill. If it is sent back to the House of Commons with its more drastic features so modified as to render it unacceptable to militant Nonconformists, it is not improbable that it may be dropped, thereby providing fine material for platform oratory during the recess. The Lords will be held up to obloquy as having sterilised the labours of an entire session, and their action will go to swell the account against them. But the Government dare not stake their existence by an appeal to the country upon their Education Bill as a single issue. There is far too much open hostility to it among those who understand the measure, indifference far too wide-spread among those who do not understand it, to allow of much uncertainty as to the answer to a question which, to the great majority of electors, would resolve itself into this—Are you fairly content with the education provided for your children as it is, or will you pay a million sterling more in taxation, and two millions more in rates, in order that the Christian religion be no longer taught ? Of course that is not a fair statement of the question, but that is the form in which it would present itself to the average voter.

Dismissing the Education Bill, therefore, as being unlikely to bring about serious collision between the two Houses, upon which of the other measures will it most probably take place ? Rumour is running in regions not always ill-informed that, for tactical reasons, the Lords are going to deal tenderly with the Trade Disputes Bill and the Land Bills, but will show no mercy to the Plural Voting Bill. If that should prove to be so, then indeed may some of us doubt whether the

Lords retain so much of their pristine value as a Second Chamber as to make them worth fighting for. Distrust of party tactics, so deeply discredited in the past, will be wrought to the kicking point. The Plural Voting Bill is a bad measure, whereof the motive is perfectly transparent—to wit, the partial disfranchisement of the well-to-do, the majority of whom are supposed to be hostile to the new Liberalism. But it cannot be said that it violates any settled principles of constitutional law or political ethics, except one which was pretty thoroughly eviscerated through the acceptance, by all parties in Parliament, of Mr. Arthur Elliot's amendment to the Reform Act of 1885, conferring the franchise upon agricultural labourers who pay neither rent, rates, nor taxes. To exalt this spiteful little measure into a *casus belli* between the Houses cannot be done; to reject it on the second reading would be to magnify its importance unduly. A course equally effective and more dignified would be to let it pass through all its stages, adding in committee a clause postponing the time for the measure coming into effect until a satisfactory measure of redistribution shall have been carried.

Such a procedure would bring into prominence the glaring inequity of a Bill abolishing the one anomaly in the law of franchise which tells, or is supposed to tell, against the party now in power, and leaving untouched the far more glaring anomaly of unequal representation, which has given that party so much advantage in the past.

Both the Bills dealing with agrarian matters—the Land Tenure Bill in a modified degree, the Small Holdings (Scotland) Bill in a very large degree—have been framed to establish dual ownership in agricultural land, which has proved such a disastrous failure in Ireland, and plunged the land system in that country into such inextricable confusion that, to mend the mess, the credit of British taxpayers has been pledged to the tune of many millions. What reason have our rulers to suppose that the muddle in Great Britain will be less complete or less costly in proportion than it has proved in Ireland?

The speeches of Lord Carrington and Mr. John Sinclair may be searched in vain for any grounds for that hope. Lord Carrington travelled to Edinburgh in October to discuss the two Bills with the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture. The tone of that Chamber, which consists of practical farmers in the proportion of 95 per cent., is the reverse of ultra-Conservative. The majority of its members are in favour of certain modifications of the land laws, have a precise understanding of what they want, and have never shrunk from clearly expressing their views. They attended in large numbers, and Lord Carrington could not have had a more intelligent audience. But he had no single intelligible argument to propound for his proposed upheaval of the land system. He repeated more than once the statement which he has made so often before other audiences, that he derives his whole income from agricultural rents: interesting, no

doubt, as a biographical detail, but unconvincing as an argument for imperial legislation.

Mr. Sinclair was not there to explain his Small Holdings Bill, or to give any reason why this measure, which is comically entitled 'a Bill to encourage the formation of Small Holdings in Scotland,' chiefly penalises those landowners who have made considerable sacrifices to preserve such holdings.

The chairman of the conference, of widespread repute as a successful whisky-distiller, displayed his degree of practical acquaintance with agriculture by declaring that he could not see why, if the crofting system was good for Inverness-shire, which he represents in Parliament, it should not be good for the rest of Scotland. There were plenty of men in that room who could have explained to him the difference between land in East Lothian and on the Moor of Rannoch, between a Highland croft in which all building and other outlay is undertaken by the occupier and a Lowland farm which is thoroughly equipped by the owner, and have shown the impossibility of any man, however industrious, making a decent living even out of fifty acres of ordinary arable land at the present prices of farm produce. It might have been done under protection, but it cannot be done now, unless under peculiarly favourable conditions of soil and climate, as on Lord Carrington's Lincolnshire estate. His lordship never wearies of holding up the management of this estate to the admiration of all good men. It would be well that his part in the management should be fairly understood, as it is not, by the general public. The land has been let on a twenty-one years' lease to a syndicate called the South Lincolnshire Small Holdings Association. This company sublets the farms in small parcels, and is responsible for the rent to the owner, who undertakes no further outlay. Some of the small holders are lodged in the existing farmhouses and cottages; others live in villages at a distance, in some cases, of four or five miles from the holdings. The extraordinary fertility of the soil attracts and repays cultivators, and many a landowner, careworn by sedulous attention to the welfare of his tenants, would find it an easy exchange to throw all attention to details upon a board of directors and fulfil his own part in the management by the punctual receipt of rents.

Lord Carrington had to listen to some plain truths in the discussion which followed his speech to the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, expressed in the vigorous, direct language of men thoroughly understanding their subject. It appeared to be news to him that Scottish farmers almost universally hold under leases of fifteen or nineteen years' duration, and that therefore many of the provisions of the Land Tenure Bill were either inapplicable to the Scottish system or inconsistent with some of its best features. In the end, the Chamber rejected both Bills by overwhelming majorities.

In spite of this discouragement at the hands of the very men in whose interest they professed to have brought in these Land Bills, the

Government have determined to press them forward. It is only fair to admit that some of the most objectionable features of the Land Tenure Bill have been so far modified in Committee of the Commons, by amendments moved or accepted by the Government, that the Lords may feel justified in allowing it to receive the Royal Assent as a comparatively innocuous, if superfluous, measure; but no ingenuity of amendment can alter the character of the Small Holdings (Scotland) Bill, which not only betrays on the part of its authors amazing ignorance of the conditions and requirements of Scottish agriculture, but has for its main principles the institution of dual ownership in its baldest form and the substitution of the least successful forms of cultivation for scientific treatment of land in adequate quantities.

The opinion pronounced upon it by the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture has received no consideration from this headlong Government. When the secretary to the Chamber wrote on the 5th of November to the Secretary for Scotland, expressing the surprise of his executive that no notice had been taken of the representations sent up from the autumn conference, there came a letter in reply from Mr. Sinclair's secretary saying that it was 'hardly practicable to excise Scotland at this late stage of the proceedings on the Land Tenure Bill,' but making no reference to the Small Holdings Bill. Upon this the secretary to the Chamber wrote again to the Scottish Office calling attention to the fact that resolutions hostile to both these Land Bills had been passed at the summer conference of the Chamber, and had been forwarded to Ministers so long ago as the 21st of June.

The House of Lords, therefore, will have plenty of backing in the country, where agricultural matters are understood, if they refuse a second reading to this ill-conceived and ill-drafted measure. Doubtless in doing so they will incur a large amount of disfavour in the large towns, where a vague notion prevails that country squires encourage rural depopulation, and that the only conditions requisite for a prosperous and contented peasantry are fixity of tenure, free cropping, and fair rents. These ideas arise from the study of Radical and Socialist journals, supplemented by some knowledge of market gardening and suburban dairying, and from ignorance of the fact that the profit derived from agriculture, except in the vicinity of large towns, has been cut so fine by foreign competition that a living can only be made off land held in considerable quantity. A net return of 10s. an acre will not support a family on a fifty-acre farm, though it may do so on one of 500 acres. Moreover, the larger holding admits of much saving in working, and the expenses per acre being less than on the smaller one, the net profit is proportionately greater.

The avowed, and wholly meritorious, object of the Small Holdings Bill is to keep on the land those people who remain there, and to

attract the return of those who have left it, but in none of his numerous speeches in the country has Lord Carrington disclosed the first result of Mr. C. D. Rose's spirited experiment in this direction. That gentleman, the honourable member for Newmarket, in order to put into practice what the majority of Radical politicians content themselves with preaching, obtained from the Office of Woods a lease of a Crown farm of 917 acres in Cambridgeshire, which he proceeded to cut up into fifty-nine small holdings—giving an average of fifteen-and-a-half acres. The future of his new tenants is still on the knees of the gods; but, in order to establish them, Mr. Rose was under the necessity of evicting thirty-nine labourers, eight of whom had worked on the farm for over thirty years. It is true that all these men were given the opportunity of becoming tenants of the new holdings, but of this none of them took advantage, perhaps because their practical acquaintance with the land and its capabilities caused them to prefer to earn regular wages rather than interest for mortgagees.

For that is the real outcome of Mr. Lloyd-George's munificent boast at Canterbury. 'We have given you free trade,' he exclaimed, with scant respect to the memory of Sir Robert Peel, 'and we are going to give you free land.' Yes, but are you also going to give us free capital to equip and stock the land, or are you going to build our houses, erect our fences, stock our fields, and charge us interest on the outlay? The Secretary for Scotland has been singularly reticent about the Bill whereof he is the nominal, though not the putative, parent, but in one of his few public utterances on the subject he has pointed to Denmark as the Utopia of small holders. There are plenty of them in that little realm, but, although nominally freeholders, they are bound hand and foot by the moneylender, who is not so easily accessible as the British landlord. Neither have these small holdings prevailed to keep the Danes from crowding into the towns. In 1860 the towns contained 22 per cent. of the entire population; at the present time they contain 39 per cent. At the last decennial census the urban population showed an increase of 44 per cent., but the agricultural population had undergone an actual decrease.

Lord Carrington desires to apply to every description of land in Great Britain those conditions of tenure for which he can claim a success in a district of Lincolnshire peculiarly favourable to small holdings. A closer acquaintance with other agricultural districts would reveal to him the hard truth that the soil is not universally suitable for cultivation in small parcels. Even where it is so, and where elaborate and costly preparation has been made for peasant cultivators, it has been proved, in some cases, that provision has been made for a want which does not exist. During the present year I visited the estate of a large landowner in Forfarshire, who had preserved a number of small holdings, locally called 'pendicles,' and

equipped them with substantial stone houses and offices. The soil is excellent, there are several considerable towns in the neighbourhood, and the district is intersected by railways, yet many of these pendicles stand untenanted. The supply of small holdings is greater in that county than the demand. The ideal of the land reformer is that 'every man shall sit under his own vine and his own fig-tree (or their British equivalents), and no man shall make him afraid.' But how if the peasantry, strong in body and strenuous in spirit, disdain to make a bare and precarious living by toil on a few acres, and prefer either to earn a certain income by working for good wages or to fare forth and see what lies behind their native hills? These are the alternatives which have stunted the demand for small holdings in Forfarshire.

As for the Secretary for Scotland, he makes no pretence of practical acquaintance with land management, wherefore it is not surprising that he cannot realise the irreparable injury which would be inflicted upon Scottish agriculture, probably the most highly developed in the world, if his Bill extending the Crofters Acts to the whole of Scotland were to become law.

The chief difficulty of the British agriculturist during the last quarter of a century has been American competition in corn and beef and Australian competition in wool. Rents have been adjusted to meet the fall in prices, the reduction on arable lands amounting all over to an average of 25 per cent., and on sheep farms sometimes as high as 50 per cent. Farmers are doing fairly well on this new basis; it would be laughable, were it not so cruel, to disturb the whole system by forcing a quack remedy upon the convalescent. Pills to cure earthquake are not in it for absurdity with small holdings to enable British farmers to compete with the wide cornlands of the West.

These two Land Bills will pass from the House of Commons, where but a small minority of members know what is implied in the term 'rotation of crops,' or could distinguish between a stubble and 'seeds,' to the House of Lords, which is still, in the main, an assembly of landowners. In the opinion of doctrinaires, this is their chief disqualification for dealing fairly with questions of land tenure. The Land Tenure Bill may be allowed to pass for what it is worth, but it is hardly conceivable that any self-respecting body of men who understand the matter dealt with by the Small Holdings Bill will yield assent to its preposterous and impracticable provisions. One would not willingly suspect the Cabinet of insincerity, but how much political profligacy has been perpetrated under the cloak of tactics! If this crude legislation is pressed forward in the teeth of opposition by the great majority of agriculturists, it will be difficult to avoid the conclusion that Ministers are striving to pile up a case against the Upper Chamber.

Let the Lords be criticised as severely as they may in dealing as an

interested party with land legislation, no imputation of personal motives can be sustained against them in the course which it behoves them to take in respect to the Trade Disputes Bill. All the objections, many and grave as they are, which can be brought against the Plural Voting and Land Bills fade into insignificance beside those which exist against Clause 4 of this measure as it has left the House of Commons. The Government, coerced by the 'peaceful persuasion' of Mr. Keir Hardie, have accepted amendments which involve some Ministers in open betrayal of pledges on the faith of which they were returned to Parliament and invested with office.

It was generally conceded by all parties that some provision was necessary to protect funds *bona fide* subscribed for benefit or provident purposes. Accordingly, the Bill referred to in the Speech from the Throne contained the following clause:

4. Where a committee of a trade union constituted as hereinafter mentioned has been appointed to conduct on behalf of the union a trade dispute, an action whereby it is sought to charge the fund of the union with damages in respect of any tortious act committed in contemplation or furtherance of the trade dispute shall not lie, unless the act was committed by the committee or by some person acting under their authority: Provided that a person shall not be deemed to have acted under the authority of the committee if the act was an act or one of a class of acts expressly prohibited by a resolution of the committee, or the committee by resolution expressly repudiate the act as soon as it is brought to their knowledge.

In the minds of most men this seemed to confer all the security that the law could devise, short of creating special class privilege. The restrictions certainly did not err on the side of severity. The committee would have only to pass a resolution—'Do not put anybody under the pump'—or, when it came to their knowledge that some person or persons had been subjected to that form of persuasion, to resolve that they disapproved the proceeding, in order to render the union and its funds immune from consequences. But that was not enough for the Labour party in the House. The Government must toe the line as drawn in 1906 by the Trade Union representatives. Not the line drawn by Mr. Thomas Burt and Mr. Richard Bell at the Trade Union conference in September 1903, when these gentlemen vigorously repudiated the claim put forward by the extreme party 'to be placed in a position different and apart from all others under the civil law,' but the line laid down in Mr. Hudson's Bill. In vain the Attorney-General, in a memorable speech (28th of March 1906), made a last stand for principle:

You are proposing class privileges. In the old days of our law these immunities of class existed—they were the privileges of aristocracy, and they have been abolished. Do not let us create a privilege for the proletariat, and give a sort of benefit of clergy to trade unions analogous to the benefit of clergy which was formerly enjoyed and which created an immunity as against certain sections of the population. Then there is another thing. Hon. members will bear with me in reviewing these considerations which have influenced the

Government in trying to settle this question. Are they sure that it is wise to remove from these unions, and particularly from the agents employed, a sense of responsibility? They are often swayed by passion, by excitement, and by feeling. Is it right that the agents should move about with the feeling that whatever they do the property of the union will not have to bear any loss?

So far as the House of Commons is concerned, 'privilege for the proletariat' has been granted in the crudest form. Clause 4 has come out of Committee practically the same as Clause 3 in Mr. Hudson's Bill.

An action against a trade union, or any branch thereof, whether of workmen or masters, or against any members or officials thereof on behalf of themselves and all other members of the trade union for the recovery of damages in respect of any tortious act alleged to have been committed by or on behalf of the trade union, shall not be entertained by any court; provided that nothing in this section shall affect the liability of the trustees of such unions to be sued in the events provided for by the Trade Union Act, 1871, section 9.

Even the frail safeguards of resolutions by the committee conducting a strike, prohibiting or repudiating 'torts' (*i.e.* acts of violence or intimidation), are to be dispensed with. No person injured in a strike shall have any remedy at law against the organisers and directors of the strike, for the Courts are prohibited from entertaining any action for damages against them. Trade unions, alone among all classes of society, among all organisations and all individuals in the realm, are to be released from the elementary obligation to pay damages for wrong inflicted under their authority. Alone—nay, not quite alone; for a fictitious air of equity has been imparted to the Bill by extending this immunity to Associations of Employers. It would be difficult to describe the circumstances in which any such association would put itself in a position to avail itself of the privilege thus created.

And now this Bill is about to undergo the ordeal of the House of Lords. The Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons pronounced a fitting *envoi* upon it on the 3rd of August:

To suggest that there were interests in the country which must be relieved from the ordinary restrictions of the ordinary law is a thing repellent to every law-making assembly.

If ever there was a wrong to be righted by the Second Chamber, here was the occasion to rally all sound judgment in support of its action. Not to throw out the Bill, nobody asked or expected that, but to restore it to the comparatively harmless form in which it was introduced by the Attorney-General. Provisions directly opposed to the mind of the Cabinet, as explained by the Attorney-General, and contrary to the better sense of the many members who tremble at the nod of trade unions, had been forced upon the Government by the intrepidity and industry of a small Labour group. The Lords would surely straighten it out.

But what malign influence has wrought upon Mr. Balfour during

the recess? Those who drew courage from his sound words on the 3rd of August have been dismayed by the ambiguity of his valediction to the Bill on the 9th of November:

It is too late to change this Bill; it is too late to reject the Bill. The Bill as it has gone through must, in my opinion, be accepted.

Can any plain man make sense out of this? Did Mr. Balfour mean that it was too late to change the Bill in the House of Commons? That was pretty obvious, considering that it had gone through all its stages; the inference is that he indicated that it was not to be changed in another place. Then again, the Bill must be accepted, 'as it has gone through.' Does 'as' here stand for 'because,' or does it mean that the Lords were to accept it 'as,' i.e. 'in the form that' has been given to it in the Commons? These cryptic sentences were followed by some platitudes—'piffle,' as the irreverent might term them—about the responsibility of the Government, of those who have pressed modifications upon them, and of the Trade Unions and their members. The third reading was taken *nemine contradicente*. Is there no responsibility upon the Opposition?

Herein is that deplorable vagueness of purpose which paralyses the spirit of a fighting party, a want of that fire of hatred which inspired Widdrington of old,

Who when his legs were smitten off
Did fight upon his stumps.

And throughout the whole of the proceedings floats the haunting suspicion of 'tactics.' The Trade Disputes Bill must not be amended lest the Trade Union vote be cast against Unionists at the next election. Let party tacticians beware lest, in surrendering principle in the attempt to mollify the resentment of Trade Unions (which, after all, only include one million out of fourteen millions of workers), they do not permanently alienate a large number of their present supporters. Sir Stafford Northcote was an adroit tactician: but it was impatience with his Fabian manoeuvres that gave their opportunities to Mr. Balfour and his fellow-conspirators of the Fourth Party.

If the Lords, from any fear of consequences to their own House, allow the Trade Disputes Bill to be inscribed on the Statute Book in its present form, they will not only be false to their own settled convictions, but they will be defrauding the nation of the right to pronounce its will upon a proposal which was not before it when the present House of Commons was elected. Rather—the proposal *was* before the country in unofficial form, in the shape of Mr. Hudson's Bill. Here is the assurance given upon it by the present War Minister in one of his election speeches when addressing a meeting of East Lothian electors on the 22nd of January last:

I see that Mr. Keir Hardie has written to the newspapers threatening Mr. Asquith and myself with all sorts of retribution if we do not toe the mark

by voting up to the particular propositions which Mr. Keir Hardie wishes carried out about the Trade Disputes Bill. Well, I am sure that neither I nor Mr. Asquith will budge one inch because of Mr. Keir Hardie's demands. . . . To make the kind of preposterous propositions which he puts forward is really only to show how very feeble is the position which he holds in the House of Commons, so far as his doctrines and following are concerned. I have not the slightest objection to Mr. Keir Hardie putting forward his own propaganda, but if he thinks he is going to coerce me, or anybody else, he had better come to East Lothian and try it.

A bold, manly declaration of principle, this, without a trace of that shilly-shally and claptrap with which the student of political speeches becomes so painfully familiar. The elections had gone far enough by that time to show that the new Government were to have a sweeping majority; but the worst apprehensions of Unionists were allayed, for, said they, with Haldane, Grey, and Asquith in the Cabinet there will be limits to the mischief to be done.

Alas for political good faith! These brave words were no more than the blustering of Bob Acres. Mr. Keir Hardie proved more formidable at close quarters than he had seemed at a distance, and the Minister who had vowed before the East Lothian electors not to 'budge one inch' at his bidding continues calmly in office after the 'preposterous propositions' have been accepted by the Cabinet. He and Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Asquith tried to save their faces by walking out when the Prime Minister led his party into the Aye lobby in support of Mr. Hudson's Bill; but none of them has uttered a word of open protest against the incorporation of the worst feature of that Bill in the Government measure.

Those who most earnestly desire to maintain the House of Lords in their high place in the Constitution have only one word for them in this matter—Be just and fear not! And it is a prayer which is silently uttered by many a Ministerialist member.

HERBERT MAXWELL.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

HAS the Labour movement come to stay? If so, is it to become a Socialist movement similar to those which have grown to such proportions in Germany, France, and other Continental countries? In the recent controversy which raged round these questions on the platform and in the Press, quite a considerable number of leading politicians on both sides committed themselves to the opinion that the movement is ephemeral, is likely to subside as rapidly as it has arisen, and that under no circumstances can Socialism ever obtain any real hold on the working classes of this country. It is worth bearing in mind that the people who are now so positive upon this point are, in the main, the same people who, prior to the General Election, declared with equal emphasis that a Labour party was an impossibility. Before accepting them as guides, therefore, it may be worth our while to try to ascertain whether their present opinions have any better foundation than those which they held then, and which were so woefully belied by the event.

That the apparently sudden upheaval of a great Labour party at the General Election came upon the country as a surprise is admitted. For that, however, the leaders of the Labour movement cannot be held responsible. To those of us who had toiled for twenty years at the task of creating a new party its coming was neither sudden nor unexpected. In this Review for January of this year, I indulged in a 'Conjecture in Probabilities' concerning the part which Labour was likely to play in the then impending General Election and after. I therein set forth the causes which had operated in bringing the Labour party into being, and gave it as my opinion that so long as these continued to operate the party would continue to grow. I see no reason to in any way modify that opinion. Besides, apart from particular reasons, I have always held that 'a Labour party is the logical and inevitable outcome of a popular suffrage. . . . It is an outward and visible sign of the determination of the disinherited democracy to have government of the people, by the people, for the people.' Since everything which has happened since January has borne out the facts as set forth in my article, it may be assumed that I am, at least, as familiar with the trend of events in the labour world as

are any of our critics or opponents, and that my predictions are as likely to be verified by events as any of theirs.

With a Session's experience of the Labour party behind us, friend and opponent alike admit that it has made its own niche in politics and demonstrated the possibility of such a party existing as a separate political entity. This of itself is a gain of the greatest importance, since it lifts the question out of the region of speculative theory and transfers it into that of accomplished fact.

The influence of the party is beyond question. The object of those who pioneered and organised the Labour movement was to create a political force which, by concentration on Social and Labour questions, would keep these from being obscured by mere political issues, or relegated to the small hours of the morning in which oddments of reform are dealt with as matters of little moment. We have, however, been alive to the fact that no party could obtain or retain a footing in British politics which ignored the wider issues of our national life, and in this respect the Labour party has not been lacking. Questions of foreign affairs, education, the welfare of subject races, militarism (that sinister foe of progress), and finance have all been dealt with by members of the party speaking for their colleagues, whilst the party vote has always been cast on the side of a progressive policy both at home and abroad. These things, however, have been merely incidental to the real work of the party, and a brief *résumé* of what that work has been will not be without interest.

The motions for which the party made itself responsible and which it directly brought before Parliament in the evenings which its members secured in the ballot included one for the Provision of Old Age Pensions out of State Funds; the payment of Trade Union Rates to all Government employees, and the recognition of the Trade Unions by the various Government Departments. In addition there was a motion declaring for the political Enfranchisement of Women, and another to put an end to the evictions of workmen on strike who happen to occupy houses belonging to their employers. A small Bill to class as undesirables Aliens who are being brought in to take the place of workmen on strike was successfully piloted by the party through the House of Commons, and is now stranded somewhere in the House of Lords. On the Committee which dealt with Workmen's Compensation, with the Reform of the Income Tax, with the Procedure of the House of Commons, with the Provision of Meals for School Children, with Electric Supply, with Taxation of Land Values (Scotland), with the Nationalisation of Canals, with the Postal Servants, and with the various other subjects upon which Special Committees have sat, members of the party have been active and vigilant.

Coming now to Bills, the *pièce de résistance* was that dealing with Trade Disputes. I have no desire to reopen old controversies, but

it will be well within the public recollection that the measure introduced by the Government was subsequently not merely altered, but completely changed from its original draft in order to meet the views of the party. It is questionable whether in the history of recent politics an instance is to be found which more conclusively proves the advantage of concentration upon a well-defined object than does that of the Trade Disputes Bill. Finally, a Bill to enable Education Authorities to provide meals for school children was brought forward by the party, and referred to a Select Committee, and is now before the House of Commons, waiting to pass its final stages. The mere enumeration of these items is, I think, sufficient justification for our claim to be regarded as a non-partisan Labour party. It has been charged against us that inasmuch as we have, in the main, supported the Government in their measures our independence is more assumed than real. This objection proceeds on the assumption that it is the business of the members of an independent party to be always running amok at the Treasury bench. Such critics forget that these would be the tactics of despair, and that we are not in despairing mood. Thirty men cannot hope to monopolise the time of Parliament, and the most that can be expected from them is to see that value is received for the support which is given to the Government of the day. We have supported the Government and opposed the Government just as we deemed the interests of the workers required.

The fiction which has been so sedulously spread abroad, that there is friction between the Socialist and Trade Unionist members of the party, has no foundation whatever in fact. Anticipations, therefore, which are being built up on the assumption that such friction exists, and that a split in the ranks is impending in consequence, may at once be dismissed as a figment of the imagination. The greatest triumph which the party has yet accomplished is the successful way in which Socialists and Trade Unionists have been brought to find a common ground for action. The Independent Labour party and the Fabian Society are the Socialist wings of the movement. In the case of the former, which is in the main composed of working people, no workman can hold office who is not a Trade Unionist, which is of itself a guarantee that between Trade Unionism and the Independent Labour party there is not likely to be any real cause for division of opinion. The central point round which Trade Unionists and Socialists have been able to group themselves is the determination to have the Labour party a separate and distinct organisation both in Parliament and in the constituencies, and so long as this continues to be the link which binds the two sections friction is not likely to arise. Concerning immediate reforms there is agreement, and for the moment that is enough : the future will take care of itself.

A test as to the present state of public opinion towards the Labour

party was supplied in the recent municipal elections. The casual reader of the daily Press might easily have carried away the impression that in the elections the Labour party was almost swept out of existence. The explanation given was that the nation had become alarmed at the prospect of Socialism becoming a living force, and had determined to stamp it out ere it grew strong enough to become a menace to property. Here again the facts completely belie all the assumptions upon which this conclusion was based. Never before was so large an aggregate vote polled for Labour candidates. Socialists and Trade Unionists worked together amicably under the ægis of the Labour party, and both alike improved their position. This applies to London, with the solitary exception of Woolwich, as well as to the provinces. In all, close on 600 municipal candidates sought election, and whilst the gains and losses just about balanced the aggregate vote was the largest ever secured. In quite a number of provincial towns, including Bradford, Halifax, and Leeds, Liberals and Conservatives openly joined forces to defeat Labour candidates, and although by this means the gains of the party were reduced, in no case was the position worsened. In so far, therefore, as the municipal elections have any meaning, it is that the working-class electors have not repented of their support of Labour candidates at the General Election. This is all the more significant when it is borne in mind that the controversy over the educational muddle played an important part in almost every contest. Those of us who are in the inside of things know that the Labour movement is growing with tremendous rapidity; that whole tracts of country, especially agricultural districts where hitherto it has had no footing, are now awakening up to a degree of activity which quite parallels that shown in the industrial centres, and it is the Socialist side of the movement which is growing most rapidly. The Independent Labour party has more than doubled its income during the past twelve months, whilst its output of Socialist literature has increased tenfold. The old conception of Socialism as a wildly revolutionary movement, seeking to accomplish its ends by the use of dynamite and the knife of the assassin, is fast disappearing. The strength of the denunciation levelled against Socialism by its opponents has brought the question prominently under the notice of millions who had hitherto been ignorant of it and led them to investigate the subject for themselves. In this way our opponents are one of our most valuable propagandist assets. Most important of all, perhaps, in this connection is the fact that not only have Trade Unionist and Socialist come to know and understand each other better through working together at election times, but Liberal and Conservative workmen, who formerly ranged themselves in opposing electoral camps and fought each other with an intensity of bitterness which only those who have had experience of it can appreciate, are now to be

found co-operating loyally together in promoting the interests of what they realise to be their own party.

One powerful aid in strengthening and developing the Labour party is the fact that it is linking the workers of Great Britain up with their comrades of all other lands. The insular feeling which our island position is so prone to develop amongst all classes is rapidly disappearing, and the British workman is realising as he never has done before the solidarity of Labour and its oneness all the world over. In one respect the movement in Great Britain has a good many advantages over that of the Continent. For two or three generations past the working class here has been building up huge organisations for benevolent, for protective, and for trading purposes. The Trade Union, Co-operative, and Friendly Society movements have been so many seed-plots in which the natural leaders of the working class have come to the front and have acquired practical experience in the knowledge and in the management of men and affairs. Hence the reason why the Socialist and Labour movement here is so essentially practical. On the Continent of Europe, where the Trade Union movement is only beginning to be a real power, Socialism has been mainly in the hands of the better educated intellectual classes. I honour and respect the educated middle-class men and women of the Continent who have sacrificed so much for their Socialist principles, but that does not blind me to the fact that they have given the movement there a tendency to be philosophic, abstract, and dogmatic, rather than practical. Now that Trade Unionism has become a real power in Germany and Italy, and that its leaders are beginning to assert themselves, there is a proneness to friction between them and the leaders of the Socialist movement, which, unless carefully guarded, may easily develop into open antagonism.

Here there is no such danger. In this country, in fact, the danger is of an exactly opposite kind. It would be nothing short of a calamity were the Labour party lines to be so drawn in Great Britain as to exclude the educated middle-class Socialist from becoming a candidate. A purely working-class movement is apt to be as stodgy and as lacking in idealism as is British sculpture. This is conspicuously the case in the rapidly increasing co-operative movement, where the dividend is looked upon as the alpha and the omega of co-operation. The Trade Union leader also, who is everlastingly concerned, as he must be, with small details concerning rates of wages, and the petty routine work of his office, is apt to lose sight of the wider and more comprehensive outlook upon life and its problems which Socialism gives. A Labour movement uninspired by Socialism would be like a motor without petrol, a body without a soul. Besides, members of the educated class who become Socialists have usually more of the true spirit of rebellion in their bones than have those drawn direct from the ranks of the toiling millions. As a rule, too, they are more bitter in their

denunciations of the evils of present-day society than are its most hapless victims, and, in addition, they meet Danton's dicta concerning 'audacity' much better than do their working-class comrades, who are apt to be haunted by the fear of risking their reputation by asking for too much. Trade Unionism is and must be a class movement confined rigidly to the wage-earners; Socialism, on the other hand, is open to all who accept its principles, and so long as the Labour party continues to be formed of an alliance of Trade Unionists and Socialists so long will Socialists, irrespective of class, who are nominated by an affiliated organisation be welcomed within the fighting ranks of the party. Already a fair number of the middle class enrich the Socialist movement by their education and their culture, though in the main in this country it is bound to continue to be heavily dominated by working-class thought and feeling. It is not only quite possible but extremely probable that in the near future the lines of development in Great Britain may become the example upon which the Labour and Socialist movement in Continental countries will remodel itself. Already in France and in Holland there is an approximation to our methods, whilst in Belgium, where there is a powerful Labour party, every section of the working-class movement, Trade Unionist, Co-operative, Friendly Society, and Socialist, is already bound up into one homogeneous whole.

Piecing together all the foregoing facts, we are justified in assuming that we are only at the beginning of the development of the political Labour movement in Great Britain. That it will ultimately become an openly avowed Socialist movement I entertain no manner of doubt. Any attempt, however, to force the pace, or to seek by pettifogging manœuvring to capture the Trade Unions for Socialism, could only defeat itself. Socialists rely entirely upon their educational propaganda to bring about the conversion of the working class. Economic development, the growth of trusts, the increasing pressure of industrialism upon the mass of the people, the difficulty of the smaller middle class to maintain their position, and the spread of the altruistic spirit are all factors making for Socialism. The intelligent Trade Union leader sees and recognises this. He may not care to avow himself a Socialist, but he knows that its advent is certain. He, however, is content to do the practical work which lies to his hand to-day, and to leave the future to take care of itself.

In my January article, already alluded to, I made mention of various phases through which the movement had evolved into an independent Labour party, and singled out Liberal-Labourism for special comment. At that time it looked as though it might continue to perpetuate itself for some considerable time, but already it seems to be undergoing a process of painless extinction. Here and there an individual does his best to convince himself and the public that it still exists, but no one is taken in or deceived thereby. At the recent municipal

elections, of the nearly 600 Labour candidates who went to the poll not more than ten, all told, could be described as Lib.-Labs., to use W. T. Stead's phrase. In the House of Commons the gulf which formerly separated the Liberal Trade Unionist from his Labour colleague is being rapidly bridged over, and it can only be a question of months ere every working-class member of Parliament who is paid from Trade Union funds is also a member of the Labour party. With 95 per cent. of the leaders of Trade Unionism in the Labour party, the rank and file are becoming more and more impatient of those who temporise, and so Liberal-Labourism is passing away in a kind of euthanasia. Few will grudge it such a peaceful end.

As to what the work of the party will be in the next Session of Parliament it is too early yet to speak with any degree of definiteness. That can only be decided by the party itself after full consideration. Judging, however, from the signs of the times, I would say that the political Enfranchisement of Women and the provision of Pensions for the Aged Workers are likely to occupy a prominent place in its programme. That it has been left to the Labour party to make the Enfranchisement of Women a party question of urgency is not creditable to Liberal and Conservative Governments who have owed so much of their success in the past to their women workers. Now that woman has entered the industrial area to the extent she has, it is more than ever imperative that her political disabilities should be removed, so that she may be better able to protect herself and her interests.

Old Age Pensions is a reform which appeals with special force to men, many of whom are themselves supporting aged relatives from their scanty means, and most of whom, should they live to the allotted span, will themselves require some such support in their declining years. With such men the reform is no mere academic platitude to be used as bait at election time and then put aside on the plea that the necessary money cannot be found. With them the question is a burning reality. The case of the Unemployed will not be neglected, while Afforestation on a large scale and the provision of Small Holdings, together with the Nationalisation of Railways, are sure to be pressed forward vigorously. A minimum wage for the sweated occupations has of late been brought prominently before the public by the successful conference on the subject at the Guildhall. The question is not without its difficulties, but since these have been met and overcome in some of the Colonies, there seems no good reason why they should not be grappled with here also. I shall be surprised if an Eight-Hour Day agitation does not develop in the near future.

Looking back over what has been accomplished, and glancing forward in the light of existing facts, I venture to predict that the future of the Labour party is assured. Already it has given to organised labour a consciousness of strength such as it never before possessed. The lobbies of the House of Commons, which in days gone by

were thronged with workmen's delegates when Labour measures were being discussed, are now on such occasions empty, save for the presence of the general public. Few can estimate the change which this apparently simple fact indicates in the attitude of the organised worker towards Parliament. He no longer sends his delegates to the lobby to beg for reforms; he sends them to the House itself to win them. For the first time in the long drawn-out tragedy of the poor, the toiler has an organ through which he can voice his demands and win redress for his wrongs. That the Labour party will have its ups and downs, its ebb and flow, cannot be questioned, but it can never be silenced or put down. More and more it will become an increasing influence in the political life and thought of the nation, welding all the useful classes of the community into one democratically-controlled whole to do battle for the social and economic emancipation of the people. There are those now alive who, ere they pass hence, will aid in the return of a Labour Government. Speed the day!

J. KEIR HARDIE.

AMATEUR ESTIMATES OF NAVAL POLICY

For some couple of years past the Navy has been given a position of unusual—it would, indeed, be correct to say unprecedented—prominence in the columns of the daily Press and in the pages of periodical publications. The enterprise of journalists, in this country at least, has rarely, if ever, been displayed more conspicuously than it has been of late in connection with naval affairs. Matters, which our State departments had previously managed to reserve for official knowledge only, have not escaped the keen eyes of contributors to newspapers and have been given to the world with a frequency to which the reading public had been altogether unaccustomed. Intentions have often been announced long before the arrival of the time for carrying them into effect. Information refused to Parliament has found its way into the columns of a newspaper. So successful have been the efforts to discover and publish accounts of administrative measures about to be taken, that people wishing to obtain early information concerning them must have found it more convenient to look for it in widely circulated journals than in official documents. How distasteful all this must be to administrators whose proceedings and opinions have been repeatedly divulged can be easily conceived by all who are either conversant with the way in which public business is conducted in this country or have watched its operation from outside. The work of naval administration is not very easy at best, and ordinary sentiments of compassion ought to induce every one to sympathise with those whose difficulties may have been often increased by untimely promulgation of the views and opinions which sound administrative principles, not less than ordinary official etiquette, would have kept from the public till the proper moment for declaring them.

Moreover, the vehicle of publication may impress something of its own quality on the matter published; and no one will deny, some will be disposed to glory in, the fact that the more ‘up-to-date’ journals of the age aim at putting information before their readers in a striking, perhaps even sensational, style. One effect of this is the encouragement of a belief that the British public of to-day is immensely less phlegmatic than its forbears; and that, even as regards such serious

and dry matters as the details of naval administration, it must be fed on frequently recurring sensational announcements, till it has acquired the habit of looking for a new sensation, represented as emanating from Whitehall, at least once a year; just as the patrons of Drury Lane Theatre regularly look for a pantomime at Christmas. How unfair all this is to those who direct our naval affairs is too plain to need prolonged exposition.

Reflections like the foregoing will occur to every one who reads an article called 'The Government and the Navy,' in the November number of this Review. The author, Mr. A. S. Hurd, assumes the position of defender of the present Government, and especially of 'the naval advisers on the Board of Admiralty,' who, he tells us, 'have been roundly denounced for their weakness in giving way to those politicians who in the cause of economy are willing to risk even the essential supremacy of the British fleet.' How greatly the officers in question must deplore Mr. Hurd's unsolicited championship will be made apparent by an examination of his method of defence. He begins with the expression of the perfectly unexceptionable sentiment that 'it should be the creed of the nation that the fleet must in no circumstances be sacrificed to the exigencies of party.' This has generally been taken for granted; but it cannot be said that, in stating it, Mr. Hurd is needlessly repeating a platitude, because—as he intimates—attempts have been made very recently to use the Navy as the basis of a party attack on the present Government. This quite inexcusable proceeding is strongly reprobated by Mr. Hurd, and not a bit more strongly than is deserved. Had he confined himself to doing this—an act that every good citizen should be ready to applaud, that needs for its execution only public spirit, and that does not call for the possession of technical or expert knowledge—he would have rendered a real public service.

This, however, is, comparatively, but a small part of his self-assumed task. When he goes on to defend the particular officers whom he spontaneously takes under his protection he really does them a very ill turn, and, so far from warding off blows from them, deals them some very hard ones himself. They are likely to find his 'precious balms' far from easy to bear.

His principal point is that the recent reduction of the building programme of last spring had precedents for it; that it was, in fact, a mere copy of performances of the late Government. His manner of insisting on this point is remarkable. He tells us that

last year the late Government, after announcing in the spring on the authority of the Admiralty—[it will be seen directly why I italicise the words]—one programme as desirable, determined in the autumn not to build one of the armoured cruisers of the *Invincible* type. Once more nothing was said at the time to Parliament; the fact leaked out [*sic*] unofficially, and then was confessed publicly without shame.

On an earlier page Mr. Hurd had told us that

the naval advisers of the present Government are the same as those who served the late Cabinet with so much advantage to the Empire. In the face of this continuity in the *personnel* of the Board of Admiralty the nation may reasonably expect continuity of policy, on which the efficiency of a warlike weapon, the product of gradual patient development, must depend.

It is extraordinary that Mr. Hurd does not see that, so far from defending officers, who, for all we have been told, may greatly prefer to be without such a champion, he has, in fact, tried to make them out old offenders. Perhaps he thinks that, on the latest occasion of a reduction, mitigation might be pleaded, because Parliament was informed of the change in the programme before it 'leaked out unofficially.' It is a curious defence of a public department to accuse it of permitting leakage and making confession 'without shame.'

When we come to his treatment of the latest reduction of the building programme, it will be seen that Mr. Hurd's mode of putting the case cannot be regarded as constituting an effective defence. A general statement that, in battleship force, the British Navy is very strong—stronger, in fact, than the navies of any two Powers at this moment—would, in my opinion, have been quite permissible, because accurate. This might have been followed up by the suggestion, that in view of our present superiority, it would be reasonable to pause as regards building new ships, in order to allow of a thorough investigation of designs and the evolution of those best adapted to anticipated strategic and tactical conditions. This, however, is not his mode of proceeding. What we are told is this: 'The best available evidence as to relative strength of British and foreign fleets is furnished by the latest issue of the *Taschenbuch der Kriegsflootten*.' It is unintelligible why we should not be referred to British instead of to German figures, more especially as another writer, who takes much the same line as he does, tells us that the book chosen by Mr. Hurd as his authority exaggerates, for German Navy League propaganda purposes, the strength of the British fleet. Perhaps Mr. Hurd means to insinuate,—unkindly, it must be said—that the *Taschenbuch der Kriegsflootten* is regarded by the 'naval advisers on the Board of Admiralty' as more authoritative than the figures of their own office. The German 'figures show that in all classes of armoured ships, in expenditure on new construction, and in *personnel* we are up to the two-power standard with a margin over.'

The effect of this encouraging assertion is greatly diminished when we read that 'we have before us—approximately in 1910 and onwards—a serious struggle for our naval supremacy, but we have a lead.' There is but cold comfort in the last five words. Nor is it very cheering to be informed in one place that 'the work of construction in this country is carried on far more swiftly than in France, and

a good deal more swiftly than in Germany'; seeing that a page or two farther on we read 'that we build quicker than any other nation, though not much more rapidly than Germany; this latter point is important because we are apt to over-estimate our superior ship-building facilities.' As a matter of fact, no less an authority than the *Times* correspondent in Berlin stated in a telegraphic despatch, not long ago, that the only reason why naval construction in Germany—presumably as to single ships—was slower than in England was a financial one; that is to say, a reason that would disappear immediately more rapid construction is looked upon as desirable.

Where the defence which Mr. Hurd has taken upon himself to offer for the Admiralty will be especially repugnant to the members of the Board is where he conducts it in such a manner as to make them appear ridiculous. It may, however, be shown that such ridicule as there is in the case attaches to the defence itself. One or two self-contradictory statements have been quoted already. We are informed that 'all nations realise that the *Dreadnought* is the vessel which embodies the lessons of the War in the Far East.' It would be interesting to know where the writer got this from. It had been already acknowledged that the building of the *Dreadnought* was virtually begun before the battle of Tsushima; and the least learned in such matters will be aware that the general features of her design must have been settled a considerable time before the first step in construction was taken. Mr. Hurd states repeatedly—once, in order to be specially impressive, in italics—that not a single battleship has been laid down in Europe since October last. 'Europe,' it may be observed, both on the map and when he wrote in this particular of refraining from building, includes England. This statement also is qualified by another that, 'owing to the sensational features of the *Dreadnought*'—the word 'sensational' seems to import sarcasm—

foreign designers of ships determined to proceed warily, and at length decided to wait until the *Dreadnought* had undergone her trials before embarking on what, after all, will be as nearly faithful copies as can be contrived of a vessel which marks an entirely new departure in naval construction.

Thus the attempts at shrouding the ship in impenetrable secrecy will be defeated by foreign Admiralties. The wary procedure credited to the latter, in accordance with which their *Dreadnoughts* will be later than ours, discounts largely the assertion that British men-of-war 'are always of more modern types than those under foreign flags.'

The late Prime Minister is called up as an ally in the odd plan of defence under notice. He is quoted as having said that in every fighting ship not belonging to one of our sea-going fleets there is a nucleus crew which 'consists of everything required to manage a ship and fight a ship' except as regards the unskilled labour on board. 'These nucleus crews take out their ship' and practise the guns.

The treatment extended to this eminent ally closely resembles ingratitude. He had said that the 'ships—manned only by nucleus crews—are ready to fight at a moment's notice'; but Mr. Hurd will have it that 'battle practice and other fleet exercises' are not at present carried out by the Reserve divisions, of which Mr. Balfour was speaking in such laudatory terms. Ships that have not taken part in battle-practice and fleet exercises could not be expected to make a very good fight of it at a moment's notice.

Mr. Hurd's estimate of current naval policy, naturally enough from his point of view, is based on the contrast between the present and the bad old times of three or four years ago. 'In former years,' he says, 'the Reserve ships which were specially mobilised for the manœuvres proved for the most part a sorry collection of "lame ducks." ' A less moderate champion of existing methods might have dwelled upon the incompetence of the earlier Board of Admiralty, under whose administration such things could happen. Mr. Hurd shows more self-restraint. He only says that 'during the manœuvres of last year a very different result was achieved. The ships of the Reserve divisions proceeded to sea with full crews and proved eminently useful fighting vessels.' It is to be regretted that he has carried his self-restraint so far as not to tell us how many of the battleships of the Reserve divisions proceeded to sea at all for the latest manœuvres, and what proportion did not get farther than the outer anchorage of the naval port at which they were mobilised, where, if there were any 'lame ducks,' even so keen a critic as himself might have failed to discover the lameness.

Perhaps the oddest thing in Mr. Hurd's defence is his repeated assertion that the three *Invincibles* are 'really swift *Dreadnoughts*.' This is to make an armoured cruiser into a battleship by the simple process of changing her designation, which this critic must have borrowed from *Through the Looking-glass*. The object of it appears to be to swell our battleship force of the *Dreadnought* type to seven individuals in the year 1909, when the Germans will have only two—which, by the way, will be real ones if we may trust Mr. Hurd himself.

Probably enough has been said to raise serious doubts of the value of the appreciations of Admiralty action to which so many publications have been good enough to treat us of late. However much they may resent the adventures of their panegyrists, the officers defended cannot be expected to force themselves on the attention of the public by coming forward to disavow them. There is a good deal still to be said for the old English practice of defending administrative measures openly in Parliament. Anonymous defence in the columns of newspapers, or even signed defence elsewhere by irresponsible and unprofessional writers necessarily ignorant of the true meaning of important technicalities, is likely to give rise, amongst a good many people at any rate, to suspicions that it is inspired. However

unfounded the suspicions may be, the very probability of their arising cannot be anything but regrettable. A conviction may be expected to grow that the naval administration believes itself to stand in need of defence of the kind ; and this may have the effect of shaking rather than confirming its credit.

The recently introduced practice of anticipating official announcements—in Mr. Hurd's phrase, publishing what has 'leaked out'—with a display of laudatory journalistic fireworks thrown in, has a tendency to bewilder the public. It may be granted that large numbers believe an assertion simply because it appears in print ; but even their faith cannot stand against repeated self-contradiction. If a measure and its opposite are alike made the subject of profusely favourable criticism in the Press, people will not know what to think. This will be repugnant to the feelings of administrators, who—with the freedom from self-seeking so long an established characteristic of our national service—desire to offer to the appreciation of the country, not their personality, but the good results of their work, and to be permitted to carry out in proper official seclusion, equally distinct from secrecy and advertisement, the important duties with the performance of which they are charged. In the end it may turn out that a demand, too general to be rejected, will be made for a searching inquiry as the only way of putting an end to the perplexity of the public mind. It is worthy of note that already two newspapers, so seriously conducted and so opposed with regard to point of view as the *Times* and the *Westminster Gazette*, have advocated inquiry. It is to this, it would seem, that indiscriminate amateur criticism intended to be favourable, when profusely circulated, is bound to lead.

CYPRIAN A. G. BRIDGE.

THE BALKAN QUESTION AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

THE Balkan question, though one day it may concern Albania and Epirus, is at present that of the three Macedonian vilayets of Salonika, Monastir, and Kossovo, and the vilayet of Adrianople, which by a similar use of classical names might be called Thracian. These four provinces stand in a different relation to the question from the rest of the Ottoman Empire, because the main part of the three Macedonian ones, with some part of that of Adrianople, was given back to the direct government of the Sultan by the Treaty of Berlin in 1878, after being comprised by the Treaty of San Stefano in the autonomous tributary Principality of Bulgaria. That restoration is the title by which the Sultan now holds the region to which it relates. The stipulations to which his predecessor consented at Berlin in favour of his Christian subjects, so far as they affect the other parts of his empire, may be regarded as derogations made by treaty from his international right to govern them as their independent sovereign. But in the restored region his international title as sovereign was created by the restoration, and exists only as moulded by its terms. In that region not merely the right of the Powers to demand the observance of stipulations made on behalf of the Christians, but the authority of the Sultan himself, is the creation of the Treaty of Berlin. The difference is one which it may not be easy to express in the technical language of international law—a language imposed by no authority, but which has grown out of examples that can never exhaust the possibilities of new types arising—but it is not the less real. The right which a State acquires from its neighbour by contract is its own to deal with, but that which it reserves in order that its own creation may not become a mischievous one is also a duty, and will always rise up to rebuke the State which allows it to remain unenforced in the presence of an evil of which it cannot repudiate the authorship.

It is Article XXIII of the Treaty of Berlin to the benefit of which, and of the foregoing considerations arising on it, the territory then replaced under the direct rule of the Sultan is entitled. 'Similar laws,' it says, to the Organic Law of 1868 for Crete, 'excepting as

regards the exemption from taxation granted to Crete, shall also be introduced into the other parts of Turkey in Europe for which no special organisation has been provided by the present treaty.' It goes on to provide that 'the details of the new laws in each province' shall be settled by commissions, whose 'labours shall be submitted for examination to the Sublime Porte, which, before promulgating the acts for putting them into force, shall consult the European Commission instituted for Eastern Roumelia.' This process was substantially gone through so far as to result in a draft law approved, signed, and sealed by the European Commissioners for Eastern Roumelia on 11-23 August, 1880.¹ But the crowning virtue of enactment and application by the Sultan's government has never been granted to the draft, and the stipulation of Article XXIII, that the laws for which it provides 'shall be introduced,' consequently remains unfulfilled. So long as it shall continue to be unfulfilled, the Vienna and Mürzsteg schemes of February and October 1903, and the establishment of the Financial Commission at the commencement of 1906, can be accepted only as palliatives even for the Macedonian vilayets to which they apply. They have not replaced Article XXIII. If they do not effectually remedy the misgovernment, the duty and accompanying right which result from what was done at Berlin, and the express stipulation which embodied them, are always there for the Powers to fall back on, and for the miserable inhabitants to quote against the Powers should they fail to do so.

What has been said thus far is independent of the wisdom or justice of the policy which dictated the Treaty of Berlin. The merits of that policy will long remain one of the disputed questions of history, but it belongs to a stage in the dealings of the Christian Powers with the Ottoman Empire which is past, and which cannot properly be appreciated without placing oneself in a point of view which now is, or should be, obsolete. For a long time the West and North of Europe took only an ecclesiastical view of the matter, and, as the Greek Patriarchate then embraced all the Christians of the Balkans, they saw in them only Greeks. Afterwards the interest shifted to ethnology as bearing on politics, and since the Greek kingdom had become free and the ethnology of the other Balkan countries was imperfectly understood, outsiders saw little in the Christian population of the latter but Slavs with a leaning towards Russia. Now the emancipation of Servia, Bulgaria, and Roumania has created new centres of attraction for the unemancipated Christians, their own internal organisation has been modified by the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate and the grant of separate civil rights to the Vlachs, and, in spite of Ottoman misgovernment, their educational and material progress is beginning to make their development possible

¹ The draft law is printed as the Parliamentary Paper, Turkey, No. 16 (1880) C. 2704

along their respective natural lines. At the same time we have been enlightened by the more thorough investigation of language and history, and we distinctly see them as they are—Bulgars, Serbs, Vlachs, Greeks, and Albanians, each with their own characteristics and tendencies. The controversies of the past may therefore well be buried, and all may agree in taking as their starting-point the situation made by the Treaty of Berlin, with the responsibility which it inevitably laid on its makers, whatever were their motives and whatever was their wisdom.

But this is not all. We must consider the position of the European Powers towards the Sultan with reference to his misgovernment of those of his Christian subjects who were not placed afresh under his direct rule by the Treaty of Berlin. This consideration involves generally the principles of international law with regard to States recognised as independent, and, especially, certain stipulations of that treaty. As to the latter, by Article LXI, 'the Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out without further delay the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds. It will periodically make known the steps taken to this effect to the Powers, who will superintend their application.' Although that Article does not apply to the Balkans, it is worthy of being quoted as illustrating the attitude which the Powers take up, and which the Sultan submits to their taking up, with regard to Ottoman misgovernment. Then, by Article LXII, not only do the Powers take note of the 'spontaneous declaration' of the Sublime Porte 'to maintain the principle of religious liberty and give it the widest scope,' but it is stipulated that 'in no part of the Ottoman Empire shall difference of religion' be a ground of incapacity for public employment, the exercise of any profession or the giving of evidence, and that the outward exercise of all forms of worship and the free working of ecclesiastical organisations shall be allowed. This and Article XXIII apply as stipulations to those Balkan localities of which it cannot be said that the Sultan's direct government of them has the treaty as its legal origin. Next, what are the general principles of international law which, along with such stipulations, control the situation?

It will not be disputed that the independence which any individual can enjoy, whether an individual man in a State or an individual State in the world, must be limited by the necessary protection of his fellows against injury or nuisance. Nor will it be disputed that the cases of nuisance cannot be exhaustively enumerated, or the measure on which their character of nuisance depends defined, by any precise rules, national or international. Rules may provide adequately for other kinds of injury, but nuisance is an injury the appreciation of which is necessarily left in a State to judges and juries, and in the

world of States, so long as it shall be constituted as at present, to general opinion, enlightened by what the wisest minds can supply after calm and impartial reflection. Now it cannot plausibly be denied that extreme misgovernment in Turkey is a nuisance to the neighbouring European States. The Christian populations of Turkey are closely allied by blood, language, and religion to those of the neighbouring States. The intercourse between them, commercial, social, and intellectual, is intimate. The sufferings of the one, and every fresh outrage which forces those sufferings into prominence, are re-echoed among the others. A state of unrest is produced far beyond the frontiers. The neighbouring governments, in order to prevent their subjects and the refugees among them from rushing to the assistance of their friends under Ottoman rule, must be perpetually on the alert, and are driven to repressive measures, irksome to their subjects and not called for by anything in their own condition. And, in spite of all precautions, raids and frontier incidents perpetually take place and threaten international peace.

It is no answer to this to say that the inconvenience to which neighbouring governments are exposed is the fault of their own subjects, who ought to bear with composure the spectacle of a misgovernment which affects them not physically but only morally. Laws exist for men, with all their moral as well as their physical characters and limitations, and must not attempt to impose burdens too great for human nature to endure. Reason and custom are the two great sources of international law. Reason does not carry the rights which belong to Turkey as an independent State to a point incompatible with the good order, material and moral, of neighbouring countries. And that custom does not do so is proved by the interventions of which Turkey has been so often the object, that the permanent tutelage of Europe over her has been maintained by statesmen of repute as a principle of European law.

Nor is it an answer to say that much of the disorder in Macedonia consists of outrages committed by Bulgars, Greeks and Vlachs on one another, of which the Sultan himself has reason to complain, and which are the local expression of rivalries extending to the neighbouring States, and sometimes arraying them in mutual conflicts. There is much truth in the facts thus alleged, but if the Sultan cannot keep order in his own dominions, or if to keep order he has recourse not to civilised means of repression but to massacre, he loses all claim to be regarded as a ruler to whom international law can apply.

Nor, again, is it an answer to say that the evils arising from the Sultan's misgovernment only affect the neighbouring States, and do not justify intervention by the remoter States of Europe, such as England. The fact just mentioned, that the discords between the Christian inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire are particular manifestations of discords extending to the neighbouring States,

points out that for their appeasement, and the establishment of order on a basis equitable to all, the influence and authority of the remoter Powers are especially desirable. There are probably some who denounce it as quixotic that England should interest herself in the well-being of the Balkan Peninsula, even as a sharer in the European Concert. Pym, at the beginning of the Long Parliament, in answer to someone who said, 'God mend all!' said, 'We must help Him to mend it.' We will not spend many words in proving that similar help is as necessary in the affairs of the world as in those of a nation. They would be wasted, for a man will be selfish or altruistic in both, as his nature is. We will rather observe that a nation which has so much at stake as England has in all parts of the earth cannot safely hold aloof from the efforts of the other Powers to act in common. The European Concert aims at giving an equality of satisfaction to the interests, or supposed interests, of all its members. It adds a standing council to the old machinery of the balance of power. If any Power withdrew from it, a stone, perhaps a keystone, would be withdrawn from the fabric which it sustains, and the whole might be dissolved in a conflict which in all probability would involve the separatist Power as well as the rest. This is a matter of policy, but it is not the less justified by international law, which, like all law, can only exist in a society possessing some degree of stability. So far, therefore, as the interests or supposed interests extend which threaten the stability of Europe, as they certainly do extend to the concerns of the Ottoman Empire and its Christian population, international law allows to all European Powers, even the most remote, the right of intervening for their arrangement. The duty which it imposes is not that of abstention, but that of acting only in conformity with justice and humanity.

It has been said above that the point beyond which States are not bound to tolerate the nuisance caused to them by the internal condition of one of their number must, in the present constitution of the world, depend on their own honest and best opinion. This results from the fact that international law, like all other law, is made by and for a society, and therefore can exist in its fulness only between units—men if we are speaking of national law, peoples if we are speaking of international law—which possess a common standard of life and common ideas on which that standard is grounded. Turkey itself furnishes an illustration of the truth that where such a communion is wanting the same rules cannot prevail as where it is present. In their ideas of marriage and the family, and of what is requisite for the due administration of justice, the Ottomans differ so widely from the European standards that they have to tolerate a jurisdiction vested in foreign consuls, and some immixture by foreigners even in the native jurisdiction, which in a Christian country would be deemed derogatory to its independence. And the consequences of

the difference cannot be limited to those which have already been drawn from it. When the oppression and outrage which characterise the government of Turkey, or are allowed by its weakness or partiality to take place under it, reach a height incompatible with the quiet which other States expect to enjoy among themselves, measures may be taken which would be derogatory to the independence of a State standing on the same social plane with its fellows. The old writers on 'the law of nature and nations' might base their system on the assumption that all rulers owing allegiance to no superior meet one another as equals in a state of nature. That assumption was not out of harmony with the facts of the world for which they sought to legislate, a world which did not include Turkey and really lived on one social plane. But, applied in a wider world, it would lead to the absurd conclusion that the King of England might not put down and subjugate a cannibal chief. In the actual world of Europe it will not warrant a condemnation of the stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin, even independently of the history which led up to them. Those stipulations, and *a fortiori* the Vienna and Münchener schemes and the Financial Commission, are justified by any sane view of international law, and must be taken to represent the minimum to obtain the enforcement of which the British Government is entitled to use its influence with the other Powers.

J. WESTLAKE.

THE RACE • SUICIDE SCARE

It appears from two lengthy communications in *The Times* of the 11th and 16th of October that Mr. Sidney Webb and the Fabian Society have been directing their attention to our declining birth-rate, and have come to the conclusion that, unless the profession of motherhood is municipalised, there is great danger of 'national deterioration or as an alternative of this country falling to the Irish or the Jews'—and ultimately possibly even to the Chinese—presumably on account of the superior fertility of these races. 'In order,' says Mr. Webb, 'that a due number of children may be born, and that they may be born rather of the self-controlled and foreseeing members of each class than of those who are reckless or improvident, we must alter the balance of considerations in favour of the child-producing family.' And again, 'We shall, indeed, have to face the problem of the systematic endowment of motherhood, and place this most indispensable of all professions upon an honourable economic basis.'

According to Mr. Webb, the majority of English married people have, since 1851, for some new undisclosed reason and in some mysterious manner, simultaneously resolved to limit—perhaps we should say more strictly limit—the number of their children, and this, he holds, is conclusively proved by the statistics of the declining birth-rate. Curiously enough, as Mr. Webb points out, the birth statistics of all European nations, with the very significant exception of Russia, show similar results. In fact the figures of the Registrar General's Report show that in fifteen European countries the birth-rate culminated about 1876, and has from that date everywhere, except in Russia, steadily declined. On these facts and some reports of unusual character collected by the Fabian Society, Mr. Webb's conclusions are based.

But it is not to be believed that the peoples of civilised Europe have, with one accord and without ostensible cause, suddenly resolved to change their old use and wont on such an important and personal matter, and we must look for some other explanation of the decline of the birth-rate in England and throughout Continental Europe.

The important question at issue, which Mr. Webb ignores, is not the birth-rate, but the rate at which the population is increasing, and that

depends as much on the deaths as on the births. If Mr. Webb and the Fabian Society had examined the statistics of deaths, as well as of births, in the Registrar-General's Reports, they would have found, that while the birth-rate in fifteen European nations culminated about 1876 and, with the exception of Russia, subsequently continuously declined, the death-rate began to fall off about the same time and has continued to do so almost as rapidly as the birth-rate, with this result, that the net increase of population per 1,000 is now about as great as it formerly was. The prevalence of war and cholera among Continental nations interferes with close comparisons between their birth and death rates, but the English statistics in the following table clearly demonstrate the fact, that the ratio of growth of our population is now little less than it was when the birth-rate was at its maximum; and, if the death-rate of children under twelve months old had decreased in the same proportion as of those above that age, the rate of increase would have been even greater.

ENGLAND AND WALES

Averages per Thousand of the Population

	Marriages	Births	Deaths	Natural Increase
3 years, 1838-40	15.6	31.3	22.4	8.9
10 " 1841-50	16.1	32.6	22.4	10.2
10 " 1851-60	16.9	34.1	22.2	11.9
10 " 1861-70	16.6	35.2	22.5	12.7
10 " 1871 80	16.2	35.4	21.4	14.0
10 " 1881-90	14.9	32.4	19.1	13.3
10 " 1891-1900	15.7	29.9	18.2	11.7
5 " 1901-1905	15.6	28.1	16.0	12.1

During the last fifty years it will be admitted there has been a great improvement in the condition of the masses of the people, and we can at once see how that should favourably affect the death-rate; but why should a decreasing death-rate or the improved condition of the people cause the birth-rate to decrease?

It may be natural to assume, as Mr. Webb and others before him have done, that improved conditions of life would tend to increase the birth-rate, but that is not Nature's way, for instead of tending to increase the birth-rate, increased well-being has the opposite effect. With improved conditions of life the fertility of plants and animals (including man) declines, and increases when they are exposed to such unfavourable conditions as would threaten the extinction of the species.¹ In other words, fertility increases as the intensity of the struggle for existence increases, and declines with its decline. The

¹ This law was first promulgated by Doubleday in 1841, and rejected by Mill. See *Principles of Political Economy*, ch. x.

last efforts of life are devoted rather to the maintenance of species than to the preservation of the individual.

Mr. Webb's own figures show that the birth-rate is much higher in the poorest districts than among the well-to-do, and he laments that under present conditions our population is replenished chiefly by the offspring of degenerates. But, statistics apart, this law of fertility is fully established by common observation and practice. An exposed tree growing on infertile soil is covered with seed, whereas a thriving tree growing on a fertile soil and in a sheltered locality bears very little. The gardener induces the thriving fruit tree to produce fruit instead of wood by cutting back its roots, and so diminishing its supply of food; on the other hand, many of his finest flowers protected from any struggle for existence are seedless. The breeder who, to improve his stock, must keep them in great comfort on abundance of food, finds his greatest difficulty in their tendency to sterility.

Seeing then that this law of fertility governs not only the animal but also the vegetable kingdom, may we not safely conclude that *human volition has little to do with the birth-rate*, and also hold that *the birth-rate of a nation is inversely proportional to the well-being of its people?*

Malthus, J. S. Mill, and Huxley arrived at erroneous conclusions on the growth of population, because they were ignorant of or rejected this law of fertility, and also because they did not recognise the essential difference between man and all other animals in this respect, that man alone does anything to increase his food—all other animals, at best, only store what Nature provides for them.

By the light of Nature's law of fertility, it is clearly manifest that the decline of the birth-rate is due to the improved condition of the masses, and the exception of Russia proves the general rule. The growth of the well-being of the humbler classes in England began with the abolition of the Corn Laws and the adoption of Free Trade, but the improvement did not begin to affect the birth-rate until a new generation arrived at child-bearing age. On the Continent of Europe, it may be suggested that the improvement in the conditions of life of the people began after the revolutions of 1848, and thus the dates of the decline of the birth-rate on the Continent and in England coincide. Let us hope that Russia, the exception, will soon follow the example of all other European nations, and thereby provide conclusive evidence of the growing welfare of her people.

Mr. Webb attributes the slight increase of the birth-rate in Ireland to the influence of the Roman Catholic religion; but the birth-rate has declined in Italy and Spain, Roman Catholic countries, and is lowest in France, where the exceptional paucity of children is probably largely an effect of the Code Napoléon's restriction of paternal rights in the testamentary disposal of property. It may be doubtful

whether Ireland is an exception to the general law, that when the existence of a species is threatened fertility increases, for although the condition of the people in Ireland has of recent years improved, the persistent decline of its population indicates unfavourable conditions of life.

These conclusions, based on the true meaning of vital statistics, teach us to regard with great suspicion the doctrines of those who condemn Nature's social arrangements and seek to teach us how they may be improved. A century ago, Malthus, the doctrinaire on population of his day, inveighed against the excessive birth-rate that was, as he alleged, the cause of the great misery and want then prevalent, and could not be obviated by any agrarian or other legislative reforms. Now the doctrinaires of to-day complain that the birth-rate is too low, and recommend us to take the business of reproduction out of Nature's hand and stimulate, or at least encourage, a more rapid growth of the population. Have they considered what the outcome would now be, had the birth-rate of 25 per 1,000 in 1875 been maintained, with the death-rate reduced to 15, and the net increase of population 20 instead of 13 per 1,000?

The following table shows that the growth of population is not determined exclusively by the births, and also that the value of the births, in adding to the population, is highest in England:

Average per 1,000 Population

	Year	Births	Increase of Population	Increase of Population per 1,000 Births
Russia . . .	1879	50.0	15.2	304
	1899	49.0	18.0	367
Prussia . . .	1875	40.7	14.1	346
	1903	34.5	14.7	426
England . . .	1875	35.4	12.7	359
	1903	28.4	13.0	458

Russia, with the highest birth-rate in Europe, has also the largest rate of increase of population. This rapid growth of population necessarily aggravates the troubles of her unhealthy social state, and may be an effort of Nature to hasten reform in that unhappy country. Prussia's birth-rate has decreased from 40.7 in 1875 to 34.5 in 1903, and yet the addition to the population in 1903 was .6 per 1,000 greater than in 1875, when the birth-rate was 6.2 per 1,000 higher. In England the birth-rate fell 7 per 1,000 between 1875 and 1903, but the addition to the population was greater in 1903 than in 1875 by .3 per 1,000.

Let us leave Nature and the natural instincts of the English people to regulate the birth-rate, and let us take better care of the babies vouchsafed to us. The mortality among infants is the great blot in

our vital statistics, and Mr. Webb deserves our best thanks for inviting public attention to the necessity of doing much more than heretofore, to help them to live and to grow up, strong and healthy members of society.

The far-reaching effects of Nature's law of fertility bear closely on aspirations and opinions now prevalent. From the superior fertility of the poorer classes, it follows that population is renewed from below and not from above. Families of the higher classes disappear by infertility or degeneration, and are replaced from the lower classes, who then inherit the advantages of their predecessors. Nature thus, without injustice or partiality, gives in turn to individuals of every class a fair opportunity of securing her favours. Natural law is the true Socialist, the great leveller of all classes, and distributes systematically, what are considered the advantages of this world.

Mr. Webb, contrary, it would seem, to his Socialistic principles, regrets the superior fertility of the poorer classes, which, as we have seen, gives them an upward lift in the social scale, because he anticipates national deterioration must be the result. But let him be comforted; Nature's laws do not vary, and the society of the present day is the outcome of the law of fertility he deprecates.

If we regard the results of the law of fertility in another aspect, it may be assumed that the higher ranks of society have gained their ascendancy by possessing some natural advantage over their fellows; but if they in their turn disappear and are replaced by the lower classes, usually considered more or less degenerate, what comes of the Darwinian theory, that man was evolved by the accumulation of beneficial differences?

JAMES W. BARCLAY.

ISLAM IN INDIA—A STUDY AT ALIGARH

THE time may come when Europeans will be called upon to cease disputing among themselves for the overlordship of Asia, and turn to consider whether the Asiatic, educated, armed, and taught by example the strength of national patriotism, will not take steps to rid himself of all European overlords, to whatsoever alien race they may belong. Those who have studied Oriental thought and who know how comparatively recent is the impassable breach (if, indeed, it be even now quite impassable) between East and West, have realised that if there be still much that Europe can teach Asia, there is also much that she could with profit learn from Asia. These scholars and thinkers—their number grows steadily year by year—will not regret a future turn of the tide, viewing it with the impartial gaze of the historian and the philosopher; but it is the part of the statesman to watch the swirls and eddies of the present, to steer through immediate difficulties rather than to attempt to estimate where the next flood may touch or what the next ebb may uncover. From this narrower standpoint we may take it for granted (*pace* Mr. Gokkale and his like) that politically the Oriental is not ready to supplant the European in the supreme administration of those countries to which we have given, by Western methods, peace, justice, and a material prosperity greater than any they have enjoyed before. I would speak, however, not for the European in general, but for my own race in particular, which has had a larger share than all others in the government of Asia. We have good reason, as I believe, to be content with the results of our labours taken as a whole; we have some reason for doubting the desirability of pursuing in every particular our former course, which has in certain directions, at any rate in India, led to results that are not reassuring. All the more, therefore, is there cause for taking into account and fostering every element that may be of use in the task that lies before us.

Now, there is one element in India, and that not an unimportant one, which is universally admitted to be on the side of English rule—the Mohammedan population. The loyalty of Islam has not wavered in spite of a tendency, resulting in our minds from the indifference born of security, to regard it with rather less than special favour; in spite, moreover, of a growing anti-foreign spirit

which has manifested itself in other parts of the Mohammedan world. Pan-Islamism has not been without its political agents, its missionaries, and its revolutionary pamphlets in India; but though it is now more than twenty years since they first made their appearance there, they do not seem to have stirred the imagination, or even to have gained the ear of any appreciable number of the inhabitants. Most noticeable was it that during the recent dispute with the Sultan over the Sinaitic boundary, when war or peace with the Khalif of Islam hung in an even balance, there was no inflammatory preaching in Indian mosques nor any evidence of a divided allegiance. The causes of this phenomenon may possibly be far to seek. No doubt the faith is different in India from what it is among the Arabs or the Turks. Whether it be that there, as in Persia, Mohammedanism was not a natural outcome of national thought, but a religion imposed by conquerors, or whether the speculative tendencies of the metaphysical Hindu mind have worked upon and modified its prejudices, it is evident that the strictness of the law is loosened and the possibilities of development thereby increased. Islam in India may be compared with Roman Catholicism in England. While the true believers are perfectly willing to recognise the somewhat academic authority of the Khalif in matters spiritual, just as English Roman Catholics have always been ready to admit that a like authority is vested in the Papal See, neither community could allow the right of political interference to pass unquestioned—in the case of India it is scarcely correct to say that it has ever been urged, though it cannot be denied that the Sultan of Turkey might be sufficiently unwise to insist on certain hitherto more or less shadowy claims on temporal obedience which in times of stress would cause a considerable amount of heart-burning in the breasts of the faithful, just as similar demands from Rome vexed the spirits of the loyal subjects of Queen Elizabeth. 'If this contingency were to arise, the issue would depend partly on what response the Government of India had previously made to such expressions of Mohammedan opinion as that which was recently offered to Lord Minto, and partly on the innate force of the feeling of loyalty which our rule has inspired—a feeling due to the conviction that Islam fares better at the hands of the English than it would at the hands of, let us say, the Poona Brahmins. The Viceroy has given grounds for believing that the Government is anxious to do its part in cultivating the good will of Mohammedans; how pronounced is that good will can be realised best by specific examples, of which one of the most salient is the rise and growth of the Mahommedan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh.

I am tempted to doubt whether such an institution could have been established in any other Mohammedan country than India, where its success has been helped forward by the peculiar conditions which I have briefly indicated. The strength and the deep significance of

the college at Aligarh lie in the fact that its conception and its execution are due entirely to native enterprise : it would be truer to say that they are due to the vigour and enthusiasm of a man who deserves to rank among the master minds of his faith. The réformers of Islam have hitherto been little influenced by the West ; they have arisen in countries remote from the touch of European civilisation. Such men as the Mahdi and the Senoussi in the Soudan, or 'Abdu'l Wahhab in the deserts of Central Arabia, have been concerned only with the internal aspects of their creed. They have inculcated a return to the primitive fervour of the early Khalifs, to the primitive purity of the faith before it had been overlaid by the accretions of time or disfigured by customs alien to it, borrowed from the alien civilisations which it subdued. These men narrowed rather than widened the foundations. But Sir Sayyid Ahmed, the founder of the Mohammedan College at Aligarh, was of another temper, and he lived in close relationship with modern thought as introduced into India by the English. His story is as instructive as his example is admirable.

Sayyid Ahmed Khan was one of the few who before the year 1857 had made up his mind that the future of India lay with the English and not with the decrepit Mogul Empire. The Mohammedan community, ignorant and backward, held his views in abhorrence, and when he learnt the English language—a study which was considered contrary to the true observance of Islam—he was declared a Kaffir, an infidel. His friends and relatives were forbidden to have intercourse with him, and for some years he lived an outcast from every society around him. But even in those days the decree of the Mollahs was felt to be unduly severe, and finally a woman, a cousin of the Sayyid, defied it and invited him to visit her. While they were sitting at meat, she put her hand into the dish of the proscribed man and ate of the food that he had touched. Her boldness turned the scales, and Sayyid Ahmed was received back into the bosom of the faith in spite of his dangerous opinions. He directed all his energies to the problem on the solution of which he believed that the future happiness of his country depended ; he set himself to promote a better understanding between his co-religionists and the foreign conqueror. Then came the Mutiny, and with it, so he feared, the deathblow to his hopes. He could not battle against the bitterness that it left behind ; the race antagonism was too strong for him, and in despair he resolved to abandon his work and to leave India for ever. He had ability, he had a competency, he would betake himself to a country where an insuperable race barrier would no longer stand in his way. But more generous counsels prevailed. He reflected that his poorer countrymen would be unable to escape from the miseries that followed upon the Mutiny, and he resolved to stay and help them to find the true remedy, as he conceived it, for their ills. At that time—nor I believe have the conditions changed materially to-day—the Mohammedans

availed themselves less than any other community in India of the educational advantages which the English Government held out to the country. 'The social conditions of our community,' said Sir Sayyid Ahmed, 'the traditions of the past, to which time has lent a charm no less vague than prejudicial, the religious-feelings inculcated in our earliest infancy, have been, and still are, obstacles to a thorough appreciation of English education.'¹ There was a profound indifference to all education, and even now comparatively rich men are content to give their sons a meagre training under an ignorant holy man. Sayyid Ahmed tried to combat this lethargy. He wished his fellow-believers to share in the brilliant future which he foresaw for India under English rule, and to this end it was essential that they should not close their doors to Western science and Western thought. The reconciliation of East and West to their mutual advantage, this was his policy; and how far-sighted a policy it was, future generations will be able to judge better than we. After ten years of struggle he succeeded in 1870 in forming a committee to inquire into the causes that kept Mohammedans from the State schools and to find a way of directing their favourable attention to secular education. Prizes were offered for essays on education, with the result that thirty-two such essays were sent in. The committee weighed the suggestions contained in them, and came to the conclusion that they pointed to the necessity of founding a college to meet the needs of the Mohammedans. The following year a Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College Fund Committee was formed to collect subscriptions, and in 1875 the work of education was begun with the opening of a school at Aligarh. Two years later, Lord Lytton laid the foundation-stone of the college. The English Government has taken a warm and a practical interest in Sir Sayyid Ahmed's efforts, and a long roll of distinguished Anglo-Indian names is cited among the benefactors of the college, but the main part of the funds has been raised from the Indians themselves. Chief among the pious donors is the Nizam of Hyderabad, whose enlightened Prime Minister, Sir Salar Jung, was one of the first to recognise the importance of the movement. Nor did money come only from Mohammedan sources, for Sir Sayyid Ahmed had drawn out his scheme upon so liberal a principle that he was able to appeal to the Hindu population also. Between 1875 and 1877 the number of the pupils rose from 11 to 270, and the income of the college from Rs. 5,500 to Rs. 44,000.

The objects of the foundation—I can do no better than quote Sir Sayyid Ahmed—were 'to reconcile Oriental learning with Western literature and science, to make the Musulmans of India worthy and useful subjects of the British Crown, to inspire in them that loyalty which springs not from servile submission to foreign rule, but from genuine appreciation of the blessings of good government.'² There

¹ Address to Lord Lytton, 1877.

² Address to Lord Lytton, 1877.

is a generous ring about these words which places the author of them in the forefront of liberal thought. He lays equal stress upon the religious training of the students. 'We have made provision,' he says, 'for those necessities of Mohammedan education which are not fully provided for by any other college. We have made religious instruction both for Shiah and Sunnis an integral part of our education, and we have thus an excellent means of improving the morals of our students. We prefer to lay stress on the principles of morality rather than on the details of ritual.'³ His ideal was to train good citizens, no less physically than mentally: 'along with intellectual and moral training, manly sports are encouraged,'⁴ and he dwells frequently upon the importance of the latter. To this end he modelled his institution upon the great English public schools: it may be questioned, whether a better model could be found, given that the students can be persuaded that the acquisition of learning, though not the sole end of man, is an important item in his early training. The success that crowned his work was earned over and over again by a life-time of wise endeavour. His freedom from narrow sectarianism cannot be exemplified better than by the fact that he preferred to use the sums at his disposal—never sufficient for his need—in enlarging the college buildings rather than in completing the mosque, 'for,' said he, 'whatever else my countrymen may leave unfinished, they will certainly finish the mosque.' At his death in 1898 the college passed through a time of stress. A debt of about a lakh of rupees hung over it, and in the internal management the guidance of the directing hand was sorely missed. These difficulties were overcome partly by the munificence of those who honoured his memory and partly by the generosity and devotion of the Principal, the late Mr. Theodore Beck. The Nawab Mohsin ul Mulk, a former Minister of the Nizam, stepped into Sir Sayyid Ahmed's place as secretary of the committee, a position which he adorns with an admirable fidelity to the precepts of his predecessor.

The pinch of limited means has not yet ceased. It is scarcely to be expected that a community which has long been indifferent and even hostile to progress should be aroused at once by the voice of the reformer. But the leaders of the movement are fully conscious that support must come mainly from their own people. Their motto, as the Nawab Mohsin ul Mulk was careful to state in conversing with me, is 'self-help'—the English phrase sounded no less strangely to my ears in the midst of his liquid Persian periods than did the sentiment on the lips of an Oriental. The college buildings bear evidence of lack of means. The lodgings of the boys, built round large quadrangles, fall short of the ideal in details of sanitation. One of the courts was erected as a temporary house to accommodate the increased number of students who apply for admittance now that the fame of Aligarh has spread, but the money to rebuild it has never been

³ Address to Sir Auckland Colvin, 1888.

⁴ Address to Lord Ripon, 1884.

forthcoming. Yet more rooms are needed: every year applicants are turned away for lack of accommodation. It must be remembered that the influx of students does not improve the financial position of the college, for the fees, though they are considered heavy in India (we in England should be astonished at the insignificance of the amount), are not sufficient to cover the expenses of each boy's education. Money is needed for scholarships, money to engage more English teachers, to separate the school from the college and set it up as an independent establishment elsewhere, and above all to carry out the cherished project of raising Aligarh to the position of a university, conferring its own degrees independently of Allahabad or Calcutta. When this is done there is no reason why it should not become, as Sir Sayyid Ahmed's courageous fancy pictured it when he started the little school of eleven pupils, a great seat of Mohammedan learning, an unquenchable source from which shall spring a regenerated Islam, true to its own principles and not incapable of throwing aside obsolete traditions.

This is not the place, nor am I the person qualified, to give a detailed account of the working of the college or of the difficulties which the governors have to encounter. I can only point to the spirit which actuates them. It is the spirit of the founder, wise and moderate; it holds fast to the guiding rules of his conception, and particularly to that co-operation between Englishmen and Indians which was the keystone of his arch. Under Mr. Morison,⁵ the successor of Mr. Beck, the sympathy between the various elements of the governing body did not diminish; indeed, it is to be noted that the college has been singularly fortunate in securing the devotion of those upon its staff. The outside observer cannot fail to be struck by the union at Aligarh of the New India and the Old. I had the pleasure of conversing with three of the native masters, who spoke English as well as I did. Their family history was curiously indicative of the race history of their country. One was a Shiah and came of a Persian stock. His ancestors had entered India with the first of the Mohammedan conquerors, seeking refuge from the persecution of the Abbaside Khalifs of Baghdad. They had settled down at Dig, in Bhuratpur, where they held lands. The other two were Sunnis; their forbears also had come from the north with the Mohammedan invaders, but at a later date, and they had settled on the border, in the wild frontier country. I asked them whether it made any difference to their intercourse that they should belong to one of the great sects of Islam or to the other. One of the Sunnis replied that so little did it affect them that he had not known the creed of his Shiah colleague until long after their friendship had been established. The greatest breach in Islam is closing at Aligarh. } .

It is to be hoped that some college annals will be kept other than

⁵ Mr. Morison was succeeded in 1905 by Mr. W. A. J. Archbold.

mere business records, for the breath of India is romance and Aligarh is a very storehouse of strange and beautiful tales. The boys come from every quarter, even from Mohammedan countries as distant as the Malay States and Somaliland. Looking through a volume of speeches, I found one in which Sir Sayyid Ahmed congratulated the college on drawing its scholars from so far afield. 'We now have the pleasure,' he said, 'of counting among our pupils Sardar Muhammad Yusuf Khan, one of the most important of the ruling chiefs in Baluchistan.'⁶ This boy's story should be preserved in the archives lest in future centuries, when war shall have left the frontier, men should doubt whether such tales could be. He was the son of the Jam of Las Bela, who was blood enemy to his great rival in Baluchistan, the Khan of Kelat, according to the customs of the frontier for the last 2,000 years and more. When the boy was about fourteen his father was persuaded to send him to Aligarh, both that he might learn wisdom and that he might serve as a pledge in the hands of the Indian Government for the Jam's good behaviour. He was a charming, manly boy: 'the most beautiful human being I ever saw,' said Mr. Morison. He took kindly to the college life, excelled in games, and won the heart of all who came near him. When he had been two years at Aligarh the cup of his father's iniquities was full; the Indian Government deposed him and set up his son in his place. So the boy went back to his own country, back from the ordered life of the nineteenth century to the mediæval turbulence of the borders of India. He was accompanied by the faithful attendant he had brought with him, a member of his father's divan. But when he reached Las Bela, he found that nothing was further from the Jam's thoughts than to submit to the decree of the Government; he was engaged in preparing another expedition against Kelat, and he insisted that his son should go out with him. The boy had seen something of India, and he tried to persuade his father that it was useless to resist the English; but the old Jam had never left Baluchistan, and he paid no heed to his son's warnings. The boy held out for six months and then gave way, and the two set out together against Kelat. Now, the Jam had a brother who desired nothing more than that both the father and the son should fall in battle, so that Las Bela might revert to him. He gathered an army and pursued the pair, promising the Indian Government that the boy, at least, he would bring back alive. He chased them into the hills and forced them to take refuge in a cave. But when their water and provisions were near done, the Jam resolved to die fighting, and he led the charge at the head of what followers remained to him. They were all shot down by his brother's men; the Jam himself was killed, but the story goes that the boy was only wounded, and that his uncle searched for him on the battlefield and gave him his quietus. The old follower who had accompanied

⁶ Address to Mr. Justice Straight, 1891.

the boy to Aligarh refused to submit to his master's murderer; he came back to the college and took service with the Principal. He was at Delhi during the Durbar fortnight and attended the Friday prayers at the Jumma Masjid, at which all the Mohammedan chiefs were present. There he saw the family foe, the Khan of Kelat, and the treacherous brother of the old Jam. 'I salaamed,' he said, 'to the Khan of Kelat, but I would give no salaam to the Jam of Las Bela.' The boy Yusuf had been engaged to a beautiful girl, and after his death she put on widow's weeds, and every year she makes lamentation over his grave. This pitiful love-story has touched the imagination of the wild tribesmen of Baluchistan, and already it has been strung into rhymes that bid fair to take rank as folk-songs, in which the name of Yusuf of Las Bela is coupled with that of Yusuf, the famous lover of Zuleikha. Such tales as this might fill the romantic annals of Aligarh, and to the student of history every detail of them is suggestive.

It was late in the afternoon when we were taken over the college. Though the rose-bushes in the Principal's garden were in full bloom, the air was sharp with the touch of evening cold that makes winter in northern India the most delicious of seasons. We were shown halls and class-rooms, the reading-room of the club, the rooms in which the boys lived, adorned, *mutatis mutandis*, not unlike those of an Eton house. At length we came to the kitchen where the chupatties were baking for the evening meal. Now, the head of the kitchen is no less than a descendant of the Moguls—how, indeed, should it be otherwise at Aligarh, where the new age catches hands with the old, so little removed from it in years, so widely in sentiment? He is a grandson of Bahadur Shah, the last of the Emperors of Delhi. At the time of the Mutiny he was a child, but he remembers how his mother appealed to the old Emperor for protection when Delhi fell, and how the Emperor answered that he could protect no one—not even himself. So they fled, the mother and child, to Humayun's Tomb, and thence into the neighbouring villages, where they lived by pawning her jewels. When he grew to be a man he attempted to recover some of his father's property; but this was impossible, for the time had elapsed during which compensation might be claimed. He draws a pittance of five rupees a month from the Indian Government—that is all that remains to him of the empire of his forefathers. While we talked of him, he entered, a tall and dignified old man. I saluted him in halting Persian, and said that I had heard his history. He bowed his head and answered gravely: 'It is true that I am the son of kings.' And so we left him among his cooking-pots, a waif of the stormy past cast up on to the tranquil beaches of Aligarh.

Sunset found us in the playing-fields—I revert unconsciously to the terminology of Eton—where we were introduced to the captain of the Eleven. At that moment there came round the corner of the

mosque the Maulvi, a man full of years, long-robed, and wrapped moreover in the sacrosanctity of a fourfold pilgrimage to Mecca. He, I understood, had been a difficult element in the college. He was a Mohammedan of the old school, little attuned to the note Sir Sayyid Ahmed had sounded. He had lived four years in the Holy City and talked beautiful colloquial Arabic, an accomplishment rare in India, where the knowledge of Arabic is generally of a purely religious character. It was the hour of sunset prayer, and we had only time to exchange a few hurried compliments as we walked round to the front of the mosque—the mosque which, as Sir Sayyid Ahmed predicted, has not failed of completion. Shiah and Sunni pray there side by side, though under different domes, and the body of the founder lies buried there, watching over the work of reconciliation and regeneration which his life began. The old Maulvi stepped into his place by the *mehrab*, the boys came trooping in from the cricket field, performing the prescribed ablutions at the tank before the mosque, and throwing off their indiarubber-soled cricket shoes upon the steps as they entered. Behind the domes lay the last red of sunset, within the darkening mosque the supplicants rose and fell in the customary prostrations, and over the quiet college courts there rested the spirit of Sayyid Ahmed's teaching, pious reverence for the past, great promise for the future, and the peace that comes of understanding.

GERTRUDE LOWTHIAN BELL.

THE ESCAPE OF THE DUCHESS D'ANGOULÊME DURING 'THE HUNDRED DAYS'

FROM THE DIARY OF THE LATE SAMUEL BEAZLEY

[The following extracts are from the diary of my late father relating to his stay in Bordeaux, April 1815, during 'the hundred days.'—EMILY A. TRIBE.]

Monday, 2nd April [1815].

MY DEAREST MOTHER,—I write but for a moment, but I know it is to give you pleasure. I am escaped from France—I am on the *sea* to Spain and send this into the despatch ship.

I am in the *Wanderer* with the unfortunate but estimable Duchesse d'Angoulême—a Ship of War, so that there is no danger, and you, my dear Mother and Sister, may rest easy. From Bilbao if the D. d'A. does not come speedily to England I shall find some method. From thence I will write a full account of my coming off, which will be not a little interesting

God bless you, God bless you all.

SAML. BEAZLEY.

BONAPARTE'S RETURN.

The first rumour of this most extraordinary occurrence met my ear at some of the small villages in the south as early as the 4th of March. I found faint reports of his having quitted Elba at almost every place at which I stopped in my way to Bordeaux, but treated them as the chimerical invention of some of the many who still chose to prefer him to the new Government.

The official intelligence of his having landed at Cannes, near the very spot where he finished his memorable flight from Egypt, did not arrive at Bordeaux until the night of the 9th although he arrived in France on the 1st. This intelligence was brought by three successive couriers from Paris, while the Duke and Duchess d'Angoulême were at the ball given to them by the merchants. The moment he quitted the ball-room, the Duke entered his travelling carriage and departed for Nismes. The next morning the news was publicly known. The

prefects who had assembled at Bordeaux to pay their respects to their Royal Highnesses were ordered to depart instantly for their prefectures. Proclamations were immediately issued by all the authorities exhorting the people to loyalty. Some individuals, calculating perhaps upon their knowledge of the French character, already began to fear the result, but the generality certainly looked upon it only as the forlorn hope of a man in despair, and had no doubt but that a few days would bring the intelligence of Bonaparte's capture, or of his death.

During several days no certain intelligence was received. We had heard of his being afraid of entering Grasse, that he had passed Grenoble leaving it on the left, and that he was at Sisteron. Reports were also afloat that it was his intention to enter Lyons on the 10th and Paris on the 20th, that he was paying his army by drafts payable at the latter place. His proclamations were not yet published, but everybody was astonished that he was not at once crushed in his progress, while pursuing his route with so few troops. At length about the 18th we heard that he had actually entered Lyons on the intended day, that Grenoble had opened her gates to him, and that some troops had joined him. Proclamations were issued by the various marshals and generals sent against him, exhorting the very soldiers to their duty whom they themselves led to treason and placed on the side of Bonaparte. Here he was received—published his Proclamation, procured money, and issued decrees as Emperor of the French. Monsieur but just escaped through the means of Marshal Macdonald.

During all this time he was entirely surrounded by troops of the King, but all kept at a sufficient distance to prevent any impediments being made to his journey.

About this period we heard of the disgrace of Soult, and began to suspect that of several others. I was presented on the 12th to Madame, who preserved always a perfect appearance of tranquillity—showed herself to the public both in the streets and in the theatre, amid cries of 'Vive le Roi!'—and 'Nous mourrons tous pour vous.'

A general good spirit appeared to prevail, and we were induced to hope that with the National Guard we might keep Bordeaux as a communicating port with England, and preserve the whole of the south, so as to cut off Bonaparte's retreat.

The Duke d'Angoulême found the spirit pretty good in his excursion, but requested thirty of the National Guard to join him to serve as a bodyguard. Several days now again passed without any intelligence. Reports reached [us] of his having quitted Lyons, of his having been beaten by the French troops. In the meantime the National Guard increased, and the young men in the neighbourhood of Bordeaux were ready to arm themselves for the general cause, but there was a most unaccountable want of energy in the authorities

—indeed so little exertion was made that no one would have supposed a revolution was threatening the country.

BORDEAUX.

Wednesday, March 29.—My journey to La Réole had in some measure opened my eyes to the treachery by which the Princess was surrounded, even in the palace, and I began to suspect that the inactivity which charity would have designated want of energy only in fact proceeded from a worse and a deeper motive. At any rate I had seen enough to convince me that the want of energy was among the chiefs who ought to command and not among the people who were ready to obey.

Impressed with these ideas and fearful of not expressing them verbally with sufficient force, I wrote a strong letter upon the subject, describing the wishes of a numerous body of the people to be employed; their impatience at being almost refused by General Decaen; and the necessity for the formation of some rallying point. With the approbation of our Consul, I gave this letter to M. de Montmorenci for Madame, at the same time making an offer of my services in any way they might think proper to use them.

In the meantime the three-coloured cockades and standards approached daily nearer and nearer; their influence began to extend to the immediate vicinity of Bordeaux, and the people began openly to express their dissatisfaction at the backwardness and dilatory conduct of the governor and other authorities. Advanced guards of twenty and twenty-five men only were sent out to oppose the enemy, and these but ill-provided with ammunition; while there was plenty of powder and ball in the city, and a general spirit and determination to defend it from the partisans of Bonaparte.

Thursday, 30th.—At length, after dinner with the British Consul at Buscat, on our return to town we found the Duke de Levis and M. de Montmorenci at the Town House in waiting, and so far impressed by their fears for the safety of the Princess as to propose her departure from Bordeaux, a scheme which had already been agitated in the Council, but one which the Duchess was determined not to adopt but in the last extremity. The fears, however, of those by whom she was surrounded had so far influenced them as even to have led to their making preparations for their departure. After some little consultation, however, these gentlemen returned to the palace to await the intelligence which might be brought from the frigate at Pauillac by the midnight tide.

The near approach of the partisans of Bonaparte, the doubt about the sentiments of the troops of the line in Bordeaux, in spite of the banquet which had been given to them all in the public gardens the day before, had also inspired distrust and fear in most of the English, a large party of whom were assembled also at the Vice-Consul's to

consult on means of departure. The confidence of the whole city appeared to be weakened. Intelligence had come that the three-coloured flag had been hoisted at Blaye—it was still doubted, but the report had its effect. Several houses of the first consequence had suffered their bills to be protested; commerce was more stagnated than ever, and upon the whole everything appeared very gloomy. I left the Consul for an hour to go to my lodgings, but returned to be in time for the arrival of the boat. The tide, however, serving very late, we waited till nearly one o'clock in the morning before it came.

Friday, 31st.—The despatches not only confirmed the intelligence of the three-coloured flag having been hoisted at Blaye with a royal salute of twenty-one guns, but also stated that the fortress had fired at a British merchant vessel that had passed down the river in the morning. The shot passed across the bows; she anchored, pulled in her British colours and was then permitted to pass. The Consul, late as it was, immediately went with this intelligence to the palace, which had its consequent effect of increasing the anxiety of the Council for the safety of themselves and the Princess. On the Consul's return despatches were sent by the midshipman to the ship and also to Lord Castlereagh, and on parting at two o'clock he desired me to be with him by eight, as a plan had been suggested at the palace with the execution of which they wished to entrust me. The defalcation of Blaye had rendered the situation of Bordeaux more critical than ever. It had cut off the communication between the city and the British frigate by water, and even suggested the possibility of the soldiers crossing the river and preventing even that by land.

The circumstance of Blaye ought, however, immediately to have opened the eyes of the Princess and her Council to the treacherous conduct of Decaen. To take possession of this fortress by some troops whose fidelity was undoubted had been one of the earliest suggestions, I believe, of the Council, and certainly of all the men of sense in Bordeaux, and, when first proposed, the task had been an easy one, for at that time the attempt of Bonaparte was considered only as the effect of a desperate madness; his progress was entirely unknown to Bordeaux and the epidemic of military treason had not yet spread its pernicious influence among the troops in our environs. The proposition, however, of the garrison of Blaye being relieved by one of the National Guard was neglected by Decaen; reports were spread about that there was no efficient artillery in the fortress, and the suggestion ended in itself. On my first journey, however, to Pouillac on the arrival of the news of Bonaparte's entry into Paris, I made some enquiries into the state of Blaye, and found that the report of there being no cannon in that fortress was utterly false, for there was not only sufficient for its own use, but also for Bordeaux, and the report had only been spread, most likely by the agents of Decaen, to draw the attention of the public from so important a

circumstance. Nothing proves the treachery of Decaen more than his conduct with regard to this fortress. On the first news of the arrival of Bonaparte, doubts with regard to the troops, by whom he had always been supported, naturally arose in the mind of every person attached to the existing Government. The first step, therefore, would have been to have prevented their having the power to give up or to declare any strong place in his favour. Until the knowledge of the entry of Bonaparte into Paris was known in Bordeaux, the evacuation of Blaye by the regular troops and their replacement by the National Guard might have been easily accomplished without exciting the slightest jealousy on their part. An order from Decaen, the Governor and Commander of the Department, was all that was necessary; he must have known the importance of the circumstances and yet neglected it till it was too late and till he knew the impossibility of its accomplishment.

The unexpected and wonderful progress of Napoleon had created hopes and wishes in the troops, which, but for such success, had never been engendered in any other than those commanded by officers and generals immediately engaged in the conspiracy. The expectation of ultimate success induced therefore many troops to declare early for Napoleon under the idea that such a declaration would make their peace with him, and the officers and soldiers at Blaye felt the claim which such a service as the declaration of so strong a fortress would give them to his favour. At length Decaen, no longer able to parry the observation on his conduct with regard to Blaye, sent a few of the National Guard unprovided with ammunition, or with positive orders, not to take possession of the fortress but to incorporate themselves with the military already there—thus exciting among them an idea that they were viewed by the Bordelais with mistrust, rousing them by such a display to declare themselves, or at least placing the National Guard, had they been admitted, entirely at the mercy of these troops already doubted, and by whom they must have necessarily been sacrificed or made all prisoners of war in case of the arrival of these, circumstances which naturally did occur. A further proof of the facility with which Blaye might have been preserved to the royal cause, and consequently an additional proof also of the treachery of Decaen, is that it was not given up to the cause of Napoleon by the Governor or by the superior officers, but merely by the subalterns, who, until the arrival of Bonaparte at Paris, and the near approach of his eagles to Bordeaux, would never have dared and perhaps never have thought of the treachery of which circumstances induced the adoption. Colonel La Coste, the Governor, resisted the idea of raising the three-coloured flag to the last, was absolutely seized by the soldiers and threatened with being shot, and at length quitted the fortress under his word of honour not to disclose their intentions until twenty-four hours after his departure.

Thus was this fortress lost, the preservation of which would have so greatly conduced to the preservation of the whole of the south to the royal cause. Toulouse had been named as the seat for the re-assembly of the Parliament, and as the temporary place of the royal Government. The provinces of the south were in general influenced by the same spirit for the Bourbons; even the towns through which Bonaparte himself had passed were recovering from the feverous and pestiferous influence which the novelty of his presence and the astonishment it had excited more than any solid reason or affection for Napoleon had occasioned in this light-minded and changeable people, and the certainty of the continuance of their commerce under the protection of the British flag would have preserved the ports of Bordeaux, Bayonne, &c., on the north, and those also which are washed by the Mediterranean, faithful to that banner which they loved best, and which under such circumstances would also have contributed most to their prosperity in spite of the temporary influence and Government of Napoleon in the north.

• The defalcation of Blaye, however, by cutting off the water communication between Bordeaux and the sea, by rendering the passage of the Garonne dangerous, and the Gironde unsafe even for British shipping, destroyed the foundation upon which the superstructure of a southern Government was to be erected. Still, however, had the Council of Bordeaux possessed the energies which the extraordinary circumstances of the case required—if they had banished Decaen from its deliberations, summoned round them all the assistance which they were offered from the people—distributed the arms and ammunition which was kept back by Decaen or, as it is generally supposed, absolutely sent by him to Blaye, much might yet have been done. By supplying Fort Médoc and placing detachments of the National Guard in all the villages along the right bank of the Garonne and Gironde, a land communication might have been preserved between Bordeaux and the sea. Ships might have advanced only to Pauillac, where they were out of the reach of the guns of Blaye, a British force might have impeded any danger which might arise from the squadron at Rochefort, and thus the commerce of Bordeaux might have continued nearly unmolested.

On my arrival at the Consul's according to appointment I found that, in consequence of the intelligence received the night before, a land communication was projected, and I was charged with forming it and keeping it open until the departure of the Princess, not only to facilitate her retreat but also that of the British subjects whom existing circumstances might induce to quit the French territory.

To form this communication with as much certainty and commodity as possible I associated in the scheme a Capt. M. in the British service who had been in Bordeaux for his health. I took a carriage with a good pair of English horses and stationed it with this gentleman at

Margaux together with two saddle horses with which I myself kept up the communication between the frigate and the palace at Bordeaux, being unwilling to trust anyone under circumstances in which treachery might have been so dangerous. After making these arrangements the Captain and myself departed in the evening and arrived in the middle of the night at Margaux. This was the first night that the tricoloured party had advanced near enough to meet our advanced posts. but on this night there was skirmishing at Saint André de Cubzac for some hours, and the enemy would have been in all probability driven back, had the National Guard been properly provided with ammunition, but six cartouches were the utmost that any of them had, and some had none at all. It was said that many of these cartridges were composed only of pulverised charcoal, having only enough powder for the priming. One of the National Guard himself told me that he had held one of these cartridges in the candle and that this was absolutely the fact.

Saturday, April 1.—After lying down for about an hour at Margaux, I mounted my horse and proceeded to Pauillac, passing within sight of Blaye and the Pâté, a fortress in the middle of the river, and where the tricoloured flag was also flying, and through the little village of La Marque, where I was pleased at remarking still the white emblem of loyalty fluttering in the wind. Arrived at Pauillac, I was informed that by boats come from Blaye the soldiers of that fortress had threatened to cross the river and occupy the opposite fort of the Médoc, which would have perhaps enabled them to have cut off our communication, and, at any rate, rendered it necessary to keep it open by force of arms. I went on board the *Myrmidon*, the ship of the Commodore, to confer with Captain Paterson. I found my intelligence with regard to the intention of the Blaye soldiers confirmed, and that it was supposed they were 3,000 or 4,000 strong. The Commodore had considered it too dangerous to send any more boats, and began to think that his ships were no longer in safety, as the Rochefort squadron might arm two or three frigates and send round to intercept them in the river. He showed me a letter from the Duke de Levis, expressive of the thanks of the Duchess for his attention, and the kindness of the Prince Regent to herself and family, and saying that she should perhaps be there to-day. But the letters which I had brought expressed her intention of delaying her departure. As despatches were already waiting to go to the palace, as well as to our Consul, and as the Commodore wished his thoughts about the Rochefort ships to be particularly explained to the Princess, and her decided opinion and her determination to be made, I immediately went on shore with the intention of going to Bordeaux and returning by five o'clock, which was deemed impossible by those who knew the country. I rode, however, to Bordeaux—a distance of nearly twelve leagues—in three hours and twenty

minutes. In the way I met many English families flying from the scenes of confusion which were momentarily expected; and about two leagues from the city an advanced body of the National Guard going to station themselves at Margaux, to put horses in requisition, and be in readiness to attend the Duchess from thence to Pauillac. I also, in my way, visited the Fort Médoc to see if there were any sign of the traitors at Blaye putting their threat in execution. Before entering Bordeaux I was warned three times to take my Bourbon emblem from my breast; determined, however, not to take it down except in the palace, I entered the town with it and proceeded directly to the British Consul's. From thence I drove to the palace. The streets were all in confusion—distrust of the troops of the line, fears of the treachery of Decaen, the skirmishing still continuing on the other side of the river, the apprehended departure of the Princess, all conspired to create alarm. People hurried through the streets, scarcely knowing where they wished to go. The public offices and the palace seemed to be the general objects of attraction. The sentry-boxes were occupied by troops of the line and of the National Guard. They viewed each other with mutual distrust. Several English had already been insulted, and several white cockades had also been the object of the indignation of a few evil-disposed people. Every now and then cries of 'Vive le Roi!' burst through the streets. Arrived at the palace I found the outer gate perfectly blocked up by an immense mob of men, women, and children—mostly men. My carriage was greeted with repeated cries of 'Vive le Roi! Vivent les Bourbon!' and when they saw me in it and recognised me for an Englishman 'Vivent les Anglais!' Then cries were mixed with others of 'Nous mourrons tous!' 'Vive Madame!' 'Donnez-nous des armes!' 'Nous nous battons tous!' 'Donnez-nous des armes!' With some difficulty the horse sentries made a passage for the carriage into the courtyard of the palace. Troops of the National Guard and the line were drawn up opposite to each other, but appeared no longer to regard each other with the union which had characterised the banquet of which they had mutually partaken. The hall was filled with persons of all ranks mingling with the pages-in-waiting, and with the guards, in the hopes of gathering some information. The ante-rooms were filled with courtiers and officers, all looking gloomy, and whose hurried, silent manner predicted what they all feared. My entrance had excited a sensation throughout. Reports had been spread of the arrival of a few British troops at Pauillac. The people hoped it, and those collected in the hall, immediately supposing I was come to confirm the intelligence, believed what they hoped, and by spreading the report gave a temporary suspension to the gloom. In the outer ante-room I met my friend M. de Bonset (?), one of the old nobles of France, and one of those whose urbanity of manner and kindness to his tenants has never created an enemy to their

master. He conducted me to the inner ante-room where were the ladies-in-waiting. After some desultory conversation with them, M. de Montmorenci came out to conduct me to the Princess. I was then just as I dismounted, hot and covered with dust. The Duchess was seated at a small table; the Council, with her Chevalier d'honneur and premier Ecurier [*sic*=Ecuyer], surrounded her. She was dressed in a green silk pelisse, a white hat and white plumes. She rose and met me in the middle of the room. I explained to her the situation in which the Commodore presumed his ships to be, how far that situation also concerned herself and the danger of her own retreat, which I could not help also hinting that I hoped would not take place. I then asked her as to her determination of quitting [?] in the evening. She said, 'I had intended being with you this evening, but will first try the effect of my personally addressing the troops of the line—' *'Je veux, s'il est possible, que Mons. le Commodore m'attende jusqu'au demain. •Croyez-vous qu'il attendra?'* *'Je ne le doute pas, Madame, il est tout à vous; mais je retournerai [tout] de suite pour le faire certain, et si votre altesse royale partira ce soir je vous rencontrerai sur le chemin, ou je reviendrai à Bordeaux,'* referring then to my letter. She demanded what I had seen. I explained the ardour of the people and represented it as corresponding with that which might then be seen in the streets of Bordeaux. I told her that those who had been to offer their services had been sent back unemployed, and that the energy of the chiefs by whom she was surrounded was alone wanting to preserve Bordeaux. De Montmorenci smiled with a sort of pleasure to hear me express myself so openly. The others and the Council, among whom was Decaen, I did not observe, as my eyes were principally fixed upon the Duchess. They were, however, silent. Madame turned to them: *'Voilà, messieurs, un monsieur, un Anglais, qui me dit que sur la côte d'où il vient les jeunes gens sont prêts à me servir, et ma famille—il les a vus!'* This was said in rather a high tone. She then said: *'Monsieur, je vous remercie des sentiments de votre lettre; je ne les oublierai pas.'* *'Madame, ce sont les vrais sentiments de mon cœur, et je ne désire autre chose que l'occasion de les faire voir.'* In saying this, contemplating that countenance which had never worn any other expression but that of sadness, although now lighted up with the energy necessary for the task she was going to undertake, my words rose in my throat, and rendered the utterance of the last a little difficult. She replied in an undertone, which I thought also spoke some agitation: *'Ah, que vous êtes bon français!'* A minute after, with an inclination of the head, she said *'Jusqu'au demain.'* I bowed and left the respectful silence of her chamber to be crowded round and annoyed by the questions of the courtiers in the ante-room. The carriages had been some time at the door to take the Duchess to the troops. It was an arduous task, as she expected to be refused;

it was a bold one, for she had to stand hours on the river bank with the cannon of Clausel pointed towards her and his few troops on the opposite side ; yet she displayed not the least agitation, and prepared as for one of her usual airings. I quitted the palace with the same difficulty with regard to the people as I had entered it. They were still crying 'Vive le Roi!' &c. After going to the Consul's, telling him to write his despatches and consulting with him as to the possibility of getting a ship which had property in dispute on board down to Pauillac, for which he was authorised to offer five hundred guineas or even a thousand, mounting another horse I rode round Bordeaux to Ramy's [?], &c. The confusion still prevailed and was even increasing. A shot or two was fired from the windows of some houses at the Royalists. At length, at half-past two or three, the Consul being ready, I mounted a third horse and left Bordeaux for Pauillac amidst cries of 'Vivent les Anglais!' examining the bridges as to which should be cut down in case of pursuit on the side of Bordeaux. In an hour and twenty minutes I reached Margaux. Here I gave my horse bread and wine, drank some wine with the National Guard to the health of the King, sent two of them with a sergeant to reconnoitre Fort Médoc and its neighbourhood, and proceeded at a gallop to Pauillac, meeting with no other occurrence than Colonel Marston and Southard in the road, returning to Bordeaux. Pushing off the boat which was waiting for me, I saw Fleming running after me down the quay. He had just arrived and was very much frightened. On board the *Myrmidon* I found Lady Melville, Lady Alicia Gordon, Sir Charles G., and the Duke and Duchess de Levis all in full flight. In consulting with the Commodore I found his apprehensions evidently increasing with regard to the safety of his ships, and it was therefore determined that I should go again to Madame and represent the necessity of an immediate decision if I did not already meet her on the way. After dining, therefore, with the above party, during which the Duke de L. entertained us with his news from Blaye, which he had picked up from an orange-woman, and informed us of Madame's offer to cross the river herself with the troops, to which proposition he had opposed himself, and for which I could not help blaming him. I began, however, to fear that the weakness of those who were faithful, who surrounded the Duchess, greatly aided the treachery of the others. Pauillac, though certainly a Bonapartist town, knew not what to do, but [and ?] took no decided step either to welcome the Duchess with the white flag, or to insult her with the tricoloured one, the latter of which I almost feared. At ten o'clock I went on shore with Captain Downs. The night was excessively dark and rainy. I, however, mounted, and, proceeding on the road to Bordeaux, turned into all the places right and left to where I supposed any troops might have concealed themselves. The night was now so dark that I could not see my hand when I held it up.

I left the road almost to the choice of the horse, which was very much fatigued, and depended upon the noise I made in the villages to rouse any troops if they were there, and then with the darkness I thought to escape forward and take measures with the advanced guard. At length my horse got into a pond; I turned him round, I proceeded straight forward, yet still I was surrounded by water, and felt it with my feet. At length I extricated myself, but in so doing had taken so many turns that I no longer knew which way my face was turned, and which I had only known before by calculating my turns to the right and left, after leaving Pâuilla. Scarcely knowing what to do, I, however, proceeded amidst a wind and rain of such force that I could hardly stand against it. Two cottages at length determined me to knock up their inhabitants, which with the utmost difficulty and after half an hour's noise I did, but all were unwilling to stir from their beds, even to come to the windows to give me directions. By dint of threats and entreaties at length two or three came to the windows, but their information as to the way was totally different to my own idea and judgment, which had been confused in the variety of turns I had made. I then thought to remain till the light, but had as much and more difficulty to make them open their doors to me than I had their windows. A woman from one window blamed the inhospitality of a man from another, saying that were it not that she were a single woman and for her character she would immediately admit me. By her voice this fearful lady must have been at least sixty. The man, with the most squeaking voice I have ever heard, at last descended and opened his door. I had, however, scarcely entered ere, finding that he had a horse, I agreed to reward him handsomely if he would guide me as far as Margaux. He was a little man with a voice like that of a weak child who has got a cold, and agreed, I believe, to accompany me more from the fear of harbouring an armed loyalist than from being moved by my entreaties. He accordingly saddled his horse and, wrapping himself up in his blanket, mounted and we departed together. The night still continued so dark that it was only by touching him or riding nearly over him that I knew myself to be near the guide.

Sunday, April 2.—We had departed from his house about one o'clock, and had proceeded about half an hour, when I observed some lights at a distance in the road. I immediately put my guide behind me and advanced towards the lights. The guide, who distinguished first the object which had excited our attention, squeaked out 'Ma foi, une voiture!' Supposing it also myself to be so, though I could see nothing but five or six horses, with a man mounted on the first and carrying a lantern, I rode up, and clattering my sword to make him believe that there were more than myself, I gave the *qui vive?* at which the vehicle suddenly stopped, and a dead silence succeeded. 'Qui vive?' said I again. In a minute more a person dismounted

and advanced on foot. 'Qui avez-vous dans la voiture ?' said I. No answer. Repeating the question, he knew by my accent that I was not a Frenchman, and, reassured, came close to me, and said in French-English in a whisper : 'Monsieur le comte de Lynch.' I then said all was safe for him ; but, advancing to the carriage door, I found the poor Comte in vain endeavouring to lower the glass. His dread had totally unnerved him, for he supposed himself arrested by the troops from Blaye, and had he been so he would certainly have been immediately shot. He was accompanied by Montdenon his *adjoint de la mairie*, who was running away in a full-embroidered suit. The Comte seized my hand and pressed it as I reassured him and told him to tell the Commodore that he had met me on the way. His *voiture* and procession then proceeded without any further fear of being stopped, as I made my guide take me into any place where there was a possibility of any ambuscade having been formed. In returning into the high road across some vines, the wheels of another carriage struck my ear, and pushing on my guide, this time I made him give the *qui vive ?* as then, were they troops, I would have passed them without speaking. My guide's blanket was so much the colour of the road that it was with the utmost difficulty you could see him even when you touched him. I therefore thought he would escape easily, and, if not, I knew no harm would come to him. To my surprise, however, in answer to the *qui vive ?* Captain Moriarty put his head out of the carriage, and I discovered it was the one with which I had formed the communication and stationed at Margaux. From him I learnt that the Princess had arrived there and was waiting. I immediately dismissed my guide with his reward, and telling the captain to proceed, galloped on, thinking myself sufficiently conversant with the way from thence to Margaux. I was soon challenged by the advanced guard. 'Qui vive ?' exclaimed [they]. I answered 'Jones !' and passed them without further interrogating. I presently fell in with another patrol, headed by a *bourgeois*, who, not knowing me, insisted upon my accompanying him, saying that the Princess must receive no more letters, but must depart without further impediments. I was incensed, but led him pretty gently to the advanced guard, who were inspecting the repairing of one of the bridges, by whom he was reproved for detaining me ; and I again turned my horse's head towards Margaux. In my haste, however, to make up this lost time, I again missed my way ; but, having proceeded about half an hour, I discovered a number of lights to the right, which I supposed, at first, to be the illuminations at Margaux for the passage of the Princess, as it is the custom of the country to illuminate whenever the royal family pass at night. Finding, however, that I was by far too much to the left, I turned out of the road and advanced directly towards the lights across all ditches, woods, and vines ; the latter of which being in the Médoc tied together and joined by pieces of stick, the horse had the utmost difficulty to

get over them. I was at length obliged to dismount and lead him, and approaching by this means, I soon found that the lights advanced. With some difficulty I joined the road, and discovered the lights to be the procession of the Princess, and to proceed from the different carriages in her train. Having arrived at about the middle of them, I had to press by them to get to the Princess's carriage, which was first, and which I found surrounded by a body of the National Guard, all in confusion, and preserving no order whatever of march. McCarthy was the Captain of the Guard and rode on the left side. After speaking with him, and perceiving by the lamps that the Duchess and her ladies tried to sleep, I did not disturb them, but riding on the right side of the carriage, watched when she raised her head, and then gave her the letter of the Commodore, and with it saying that all was safe in the way. We were then proceeding at a trot. She lowered the glass and waved her handkerchief out of it in sign of thanks. From this period I kept close to the carriage door, and had time to observe the gloomy procession. To lighten the intense darkness by which we were surrounded, every carriage had lamps before and behind, and many of the postillions also carried lamps or torches in their hands. The procession consisted of five or six carriages conveying the suite of Madame, and two cars with effects of plate, money, &c. As well as the National Guard, there were likewise two or three *en bourgeois* and two or three of *garde royale à cheval* who accompanied us. The procession, moving so slowly amidst such darkness, had a most melancholy effect, and appeared perfectly funereal, particularly when the black horsehair of the helmets was shown by the light flashing upon [them]. Here was, indeed, time and subject for meditation. The whole tissue of the life of the unfortunate Princess, who, after only one year's tranquillity and return, was again flying for the second time from her country, entirely separated from every branch of her family, formed such a melancholy subject for contemplation that it must have had an effect upon the most unthinking and insensible mind. What a proof of the uncertainty of human affairs! But a few days before I had been presented to her in the midst of her palace, surrounded by crowds of adulating courtiers; herself secure of the perpetual possession of the throne of her ancestors, for then Bonaparte's attempt had excited no fears; and now I was by her side, in her flight from that country where she had almost reigned, and with all that she could count her own surrounding her. What a contrast! her entrance into Bordeaux, the fifth of the same month, when the congregated voices of thousands seemed inefficient to testify their gladness and joy at her reception, to a procession in which nothing was heard but the horses' feet and the whips of the postillions. Yet the people who thus suffered the Princess to depart quietly, because attacked by a few hundred troops, were those who the day before even would not permit her to pass the streets without over-

whelming her with acclamations ; and who drew tears from her at the theatre with cries of ' Nous mourrons tous pour vous ! ' Shameless and degenerate nation, blest with the richest country in Europe, blest with talents which, if combined with constancy, might tend to the happiness of your country and Europe ; but losing yourselves from a contemptible love of novelty and an incertitude of action, which degenerates you below those who are your inferiors in every gift of nature. Had the men possessed the spirit and patriotism of the women, France had never been again temporarily lost to the Bourbons. This is not an observation applicable to any particular place, but to the whole of France, and an observation made by those who had a better opportunity of judging than myself. As the bridges over which we were to pass were in some measure dilapidated, peasants had been sent to place temporary boards so that the carriages might pass over in safety, and this had given some idea to the neighbourhood through which we were to pass of the coming of the Duchess, so that at each of these stations the peasantry had left their beds, and with lanterns and torches were waiting our arrival. They had placed bunches of straw on the palisades and in the way, which they lighted as we arrived, and which expired before we passed, forming a temporary fire to give a momentary gleam amid the gloom of night, as the last year of happiness had beamed upon the sorrowful life of the unfortunate Duchess d'Angoulême. These peasants were in general silent. Those who spoke spoke in a voice which plainly displayed that they were affected at her departure. From one of the bridges a man followed us to some distance with a lantern, and sobbing out continually ' Adieu, malheureuse ! adieu, Madame ! adieu, braves ! protégez-la,' he pursued his track for some distance. At length the morning, rising cloudy and misty, gave to light our forlorn band, which still proceeded silently. At the little village of La Marque, the white flag was still flying, and a person, on the part of the mayor was ready in the road with thirteen horses, which he had assembled in the village to offer to her Royal Highness. The *adjoint* of the mayor was mounted, and as he looked into the carriage, and saw it pass, he threw his eyes upwards and by a most energetic action of his arm expressed his indignation at the necessity of her flight. He followed us for some distance after he had sent the horses home. Her Royal Highness now sometimes conversed with me as we passed along. An officer pointed out Blaye to her, which had been the cause of her flight. She regarded it silently. Her features expressed firmness mixed with sensibility, and she appeared determined to support herself and those around her. A little before arriving I asked her if she would embark immediately, and on her answering ' Yes,' spurred on my poor tired horse to prepare the boat. Arrived at La Fleury [?], a Frenchman, pulling me into a room and locking the door, told me that many boats filled with armed men, and carrying each a carronade, had that morning quitted Blaye for the

purpose of attacking us in going on board, but on his knees he requested my secrecy as to the person from whom I had the information. I went, therefore, immediately on board to inform the Commodore, and found them already charging the guns in consequence of having seen so many boats with soldiers. Captain Downs, who then came on shore to receive the Duchess, ordered all the men in the boat to be armed, and a carronade to be put in the head. He took his own pistols and desired me to take mine, which I accordingly did, and they were deposited in the boat. On arriving on shore I sent the National Guard, already arrived, to meet the Duchess and to conduct her to the quay. Finding her, however, busy, we went into the town, and found that, being Sunday, they had gone to Mass before embarkation, and although this did not exactly accord with our ideas, particularly with those of the Captain, who was impatient, yet we respected the motive which led to it, and followed her to the house where she breakfasted. A slight repast only had been prepared, of which the Duchess partook; the room was closed to all but her ladies, her chevaliers, and ourselves. It was here that I had an opportunity of witnessing her courage and firmness. Two or three of the ladies round her were weeping; many of the men were certainly not much better, and all were so deeply impressed with the events which had just occurred, with the existing circumstances and with those which might probably arrive, that perhaps every countenance, at least every French countenance, was perfectly clouded and lengthened with gloom. I confess that in spite of our melancholy adventure, in spite of all the gloomy appearances by which we were surrounded, the general distress of the French had such a mixture of the grotesque that I was almost inclined to smile; the quickly recurring idea, however, of the armed boats and carronades soon repressed any rising hilarity, and mixed with my fears for the Princess great ideas of personal safety. I first expressed my fears to her that there were no beds on board on which she and her ladies could sleep. 'N'importe, M. Jones, nous pouvons nous mettre là!' pointing to the floor. After consulting with the Captain, I gave her an account of the armed boats, and that in consequence we were all armed, and had put a carronade on board the pinnace. 'Tant mieux! tant mieux!' said she. 'Le capitaine ne peut pas vous saluer, Madamie, parce que tous les canons sont chargés de bullets.' 'N'importe, M. Jones, s'il ne peut pas me saluer il peut me défendre, et c'est mieux!' The Captain had also said this to me. Such was the tenor of her conduct and conversation through scenes under which many strong minds would have shrunk, but in which that of the Duchess d'Angoulême seemed to acquire fresh strength, and to consider increased dangers only as fresh stimulants to exertion. At length, her Royal Highness being nearly ready to depart, the Captain and myself went to the quay to be ready to receive her. The carriage could not come to the boat by near a hundred yards for some posts;

it rained excessively, but still all the population of Pauillac was assembled to see her. At the house where she breakfasted she received the authorities, and one she reproved for his disloyalty. At length the carriage arrived, I borrowed an umbrella from an old woman, the Duchess alighted, and taking hold of the Captain's arm with one hand and of mine with the other we proceeded towards the boat. It was in this march that her feelings became too powerful almost to be restrained. The volunteers and National Guard who followed and surrounded us gave loose to theirs, and sobbed out their adieux with voices scarcely audible for their tears. 'The Duchess was excessively agitated, sobbed almost convulsively from a wish to restrain the ebullition of her feelings, and some few tears rolled down her cheeks in large drops. We handed her immediately into the boat with her ladies and Montmorenci, and nearly covered them with flags. The National Guard, &c., from Bordeaux, exclaimed: 'N'oubliez pas Bordeaux, Madame, n'oubliez pas les Bordelais. Revenez parmi nous; nous ne serons pas heureux sans vous.' 'Je ne vous oublierai pas, bons Bordelais—Je reviendrai, je reviendrai.' All this was sobbed more than said. They then drew their swords, and flourishing them over the boat 'A vous braves nous consignons notre princesse; protégez-la, protégez-la.' The Captain said in English, 'She is as safe now as if she was in England,' words which were, I found on my return to Bordeaux, much distorted, and had created some displeasure against Captain Downs, who did everything in his power to please, who would have died rather than any harm had happened to the Duchess, and who meant to express only what he thought would gratify the people in explaining that upon the sea she was in England. The boat pushed off, and we arrived and got on board without being attacked. The boats hovered about, but were afraid of us on the water as well, perhaps, as of those on land. The boat went back for the suite, baggage, &c., of which there was an enormous quantity, and to prevent imposition it was necessary to have a list of the suite to be admitted, which was made by Montmorenci. The Captain and myself went with Madame into the cabin. She desired me to ask him if he was at her orders, or if his directions were to take her immediately to England. The Captain answered that he was at her orders. She then asked for a map. The Captain had only a chart of the coast on board, which he gave me. It was dedicated to Bonaparte, Chief Consul. She laid her finger upon his name, and said: 'Consul en chef, aie! alors.' We looked along the coast together, and I secretly wished her to go to Spain, as I was then really in hopes that some attempt on that part of France would enable her to re-enter almost immediately, and I well knew the electric effect of her presence upon the French people. She asked me a great deal about the country—the people, the parties, &c., and I said it would be very easy for some one to cross the frontiers to gain information of the Duke and

of France. She then asked me if she went if I would accompany her. I said, Most willingly, and that I would myself cross the frontiers, or do anything in my power if she would accept my services: 'Je les accepterai avec plaisir.' She then pointed out to San Sebastian, from which I dissuaded her in consequence of its ruined state, and of the detestation existing against both our nations, and mentioned Bilbao as the fittest place, being at once safe and retired, and where she would learn intelligence nearly as soon, and meet with every degree of comfort. She still, however, lingered round Pasajes, which I told her was a miserable spot, totally divested of accommodation, besides being so near as to render it unsafe, which latter argument she would not hear of. It was at length, however, left undetermined until to-morrow. The whole of this conference, we were *tête-à-tête*, being only interrupted by a young yeoman of the guard of honour who came, and on his knees requested to be admitted in her suite, even as a footman to accompany her, which, however, she could not grant. Hearing some noise above I went to see by what it was occasioned, and found a boatload of National Guards, exclaiming: 'Nous voulons voir notre Princesse, encore une fois.' I descended to tell her of their request. She first presented herself at a port on the middle deck, but afterwards ascended to the quarter-deck to address them from the hatchway. The scene that now took place was truly affecting—the men in the boat in tears—climbing up the side of the ship to kiss the hem of her pelisse—herself agitated, resting now upon the Captain, now upon me. Her face covered with tears, to which, for the first time, she seemed to give full power, while her energetic expressions of consolation, of hopes of return—of promises to make the Bordelais happy—formed a strong contrast to the appearances of sorrow which surrounded us. 'Des souvenirs, des souvenirs, Madame,' exclaimed the National Guard in the boat. I descended to search through her bag for ribbons, but could [find] but a few narrow ones of red, green, and white, which were soon distributed. I then, as a last resource, took three feathers from her bonnet, which as I stood rather before her on the hatchway were immediately seized by those below. I insisted, however, on their return that Madame might give them with her own hands. My demand was complied with. I gave them to the Duchess, who gave them herself to the gentlemen below. On my return to Bordeaux I saw small particles of these feathers set in the most expensive rings, and worn by the first women of the city. With that she took her last leave of them, and suffered me to hand her to the cabin, exclaiming through her sobs, 'Braves gens, ils sont braves gens, n'est-ce pas, M. Jones?' The Captain himself had been affected at this scene and the rough sailors acknowledged it was very moving, though fighting was always better than crying. Captain M. now came on board, and was a little mortified that I talked of going to Spain, as he said he should be alone without knowing what to do at Bordeaux. The

Commodore also arrived with the Duke and Duchess de Lévis, to pay their respects, and now began the confusion about Pasajes, among those who really were, and those who imagined themselves to be in danger. For everybody at once magnified his services into what might be considered by the new government treason, and immediately imagined himself a conspicuous object of its jealousy. Of all of them, however, I was convinced that M. le Comte de Lynch and his brother and *adjoint* M. de Montdenon with the venerable M. Desèze mentioned in the will of Louis the Sixteenth and his son were those only who ran any real risk, and these certainly might have been sacrificed upon the scaffold, and most probably would. (The Duke de Levis telling us in the name of the Duchess that Crosses of honour would have been given to myself and Moriarty, had they not now been dishonoured.) They were, therefore, provided with passages. The wind now being fair, I went in the jolly boat with Moriarty on shore for the two or three shirts which I had provided to change in my journey to Pauillac, and which was the only provision, with my father's little bible and ink-stand, which I had for the voyage. The ship was under weigh when we left her, but we had full time to catch her in half an hour. Unfortunately, however, we met the head cook of the Princess on shore, receiving wine which the mayor had sent her, and purchasing provisions, and being obliged to wait for him when we set out the ship was already at some distance; but still we thought an hour or two would bring us up. It was about one o'clock when we left Pauillac. We pulled, however, in vain. The ship gained considerably. The boat was loaded with this wine, two live sheep, some other stock, and the fat steward. The little midshipman, whose mess hour was long past, became very impatient, and at length towards evening almost in despair. The men, too, began to grumble, when I opened a bottle of brandy of the steward's and distributed it among the men, and gave some of the fruit to the midshipman. Night, however, came on, and we could no longer see the ship. The merchantmen had dropped down past us one by one and were no more to be seen. The cook now began to bewail his fate, but more that of the Duchess while she was deprived of him. The men began to be mutinous, and I was obliged to support the little midshipman's authority with expressions strong enough and sufficiently threatening to silence them, make them take up their oars and pull us across the tide to a light that appeared about a league distant, which the little midshipman averred to be a merchantman, and which the sailors swore was a light on shore. As it was cold I had pulled one of the sheep over my feet and shrouded the Mid as well as I could. At length, about half-past eleven, we reached the light, and found ourselves on board the *Edward*, where we were most hospitably received by Mr. Barton and his family, who gave us tea and supper, much to the comfort of the Mid who laid himself down and slept contentedly immediately after. The cook could not

eat, as he averred that the Duchess would be 'désolée' without him, that there was nobody but him to cook her anything, &c. With Mr. Barton's family were two of Mr. Downing's sons, who, having been conspicuous in the National Guard à cheval, were going to England to wait the event. One of them gave me half his berth where we lay head and tail with our clothes on.

Monday, April 3.—At about four o'clock we were awakened by some talking on deck, and hearing the word boats, the armed ones at Pauillac immediately occurred to me. I immediately ascended, and truly enough found the Captain, master, and mate in some trepidation with regard to three boats which were advancing towards us abreast, and with a very warlike appearance. They told me their fears, and I told them there were certainly armed boats in the river but called up our men-of-war, seamen, and Mid, who understood these better, to ask their opinion. They all said they never saw boats advance in such a manner, unless to an attack. 'Well, master,' said I, 'what arms have you on board?' 'Only two muskets,' replied he, 'that have not been fired these three years, and an old blunderbuss.' Hum, thought I, 'But these four swivel guns?' 'Oh, sir, they are only for show.' 'And no sabres?' 'No, sir.' 'No bayonets?' 'No, sir.' 'Come, Mid, order the boat, the only thing we can do for them is to bring them assistance.' We accordingly entered the boat, and as well as we could by crossing them, ascertained that the boats were loaded and not armed, so we streaked away for the *Wanderer*, which we reached in about three hours.

EMILY A. TRIBE (*née* BEAZLEY).

*SEMI-SERIOUS SPECULATIONS
ON SHOEMAKERS, SOCIALISM, AND
REINCARNATION.*

It has often struck me as a curious thing that in all the countries I have inhabited shoemakers should generally have been Socialists.

What, I wondered, produced this odd phenomenon ?

.. It was hardly to be supposed that souls with socialistic tendencies incarnate by preference in shoemakers, as they could further their views just as well in other walks of life. It therefore became clear to me that there was something in the fact of shoemaking which favours this form of belief. At one time I thought I was on the right track, and that it was the handling and the smell of leather that did it ; for material things, especially smells and scents, have strange effects on souls, but then all tanners and saddlers would be Socialists, and this certainly is not the case, so I had to give up this theory.

There is nothing like going to the root of things, so I set to work to learn how to make shoes, and I came to the very matter-of-fact and every-day conclusion that it was nothing more nor less than all the leisure shoemakers have to chatter over their work which turns them into discontented politicians ; for discontented they are, as they have not yet got what they want.

I found shoemaking very pleasant and amusing work, and as I had nobody to chatter to, I did so to my own thoughts, and I will here jot down those parts of the conversation which offer suggestions for the happiness of the greatest number, on what I venture to think is a better basis than shoemakers' Socialism.

It would, of course, be possible to have time to talk without airing grievances which would lead one to Socialism, but my observations led me to the conclusion that shoemakers have some special difficulties in life to contend with.

Shoemaking, it is true, requires no particular effort of the mind or body as long as you remain in the beaten track, but here comes in the *crux* of the matter. Unless you are a heaven-born genius you have no hope of ever achieving the slightest distinction, and it is

quite clear, by the extraordinary mass of bad shoes that are made all over the world, that very few heaven-born geniuses go into the trade.

It is irritating never to get any further, and it leads to dissatisfaction, and dissatisfaction, especially when there is so much time for talk, leads to mischief.

I can at this moment only remember one shoemaking genius, unless we include the resourceful Captain of Köpenick, and he, like the former, did not show his genius in shoemaking. Jacob Böhme's greatness lay in metaphysics and transcendentalism, and I believe that, were the truth known, both he and the famous captain were cobblers, which opens a much wider field of action, as cobblers can turn their hands to anything.

Jacob Böhme, the 'Illuminé' and occultist, believed in Reincarnation, and, therefore, instead of being dissatisfied with his lot, made or mended his shoes to the best of his ability, and with perfect serenity and contentment, persuaded that there must be some hiatus in his character which, in order to be well filled up, rounded off, and polished over, required his making shoes, or mending them, during this one short incarnation of his. Only those who are far advanced in the philosophy of life, and who have already many incarnations behind them, incarnations which have formed their minds and characters, will accept an adverse fate as a further step to perfection. They submit to the sorrows, trials, and disappointments of life with resignation, for they know that it means advance.

It is impossible here to enter fully into the intricacies of Reincarnation, and though a large number of the more thoughtful public now believe in it, I will, in order to make myself clear to those to whom the theme is new, say that when I speak of young souls I mean those newly evolved into humanity, or who, at all events, have only a few incarnations behind them. It is probable that shoemakers in the aggregate are young, elementary, and unformed souls, who fret and fume at what they consider the injustice of their lot, and this leads them to Socialism.

Socialism! This word we hear everywhere and in every country at the present moment, and in every mouth it has a different signification.

What is it really, and where does it exist?

Metastasio's quib on the fidelity of lovers seems to suit it exactly.

La fede degli amanti
E come l'Araba Fenice:
Che ci sia ciascun lo dice;
Dove sia nessun lo sa.

The faith of lovers
Is like the Arabian Phoenix:
That it exists, everyone says;
Where it is, nobody knows.

In theory Socialism is most seductive. Delightful writers, like William Morris and others of that school, have given us poetic pictures

of a world where all are equal, where work is pleasure and no payment given or received. No mention is made in those amusing fairy tales of food or other necessities of life, and they are founded on the supposition that the world is peopled with archangels only. But the necessities exist, and the archangels don't. The experiment might, therefore, prove neither safe, nor agreeable.

In practice, at least up to the present moment, Socialism differs considerably from these idyllic recitals. In spite of all my researches I have never yet been able to find a Socialist willing to divide his substance, if he had any, with his fellows.

I travelled the other day with the manager of one of the greatest motor works in Northern Italy, and he told me that his many thousand workmen were all Socialists.

'And do the more skilled ones, who receive higher wages, divide with the others?' I asked sympathetically.

'Oh, no,' he said, 'they only all want more.'

In fact, the only man of whom I ever heard that he acted up to socialistic principles, though he was not one by conviction, was one of the Rothschilds at Vienna.

One day an unemployed workman came to him, anathematising him for his heartlessness, and preaching equal division.

The baron listened patiently, and when the man had done he said:

'Very well, you say I have so many millions which ought to be equally divided in the country. There are so-and-so many inhabitants in the Austrian Empire, therefore each person would receive nine florins and twenty kreuzers. Here are nine florins and twenty kreuzers; they are your part. Good-bye, and don't bother me any more.'

The lesson the baron enforced by his action, though a very simple one, is apparently a very difficult one for the socialistic mind to master.

The unemployed was no better off than he had been before, and had the baron gone on with the just distribution of his money, nobody would have been the better for it. The only difference it would have made was that it would have left him a beggar.

It is the tendency of to-day to level everything with the idea of equalising the position of all. But, much as this may be tried, it cannot be done, for there are gifts which come straight from God, which never can be divided, and which are some of the greatest powers on earth, even more than money. Such, for instance, are a man's brains, his character, cleverness, and wit; a woman's grace, charm, and beauty. Factors such as these will always disturb the equilibrium of every artificial distribution. The cardinal mistake the Socialists make is that they are bent upon levelling down, when they ought, if they have the real weal of humanity at heart, to level up.

There is one theory, or let us rather say belief, which, if it goes on spreading as it has done within the last few years, may perhaps victoriously cope with the warped ideals of the disappointed in this world.

The ever-increasing masses of those who study Reincarnation and believe in it, know that every soul when it has to reincarnate asks for, accepts or is given, the place most adapted to its mental state and future requirements to bring it to perfection.

Thus a young soul which has only lately evolved into humanity will generally be placed in a position and surroundings in which its ignorance, its lower instincts, and unbridled passions cannot work the harm they would in a high, powerful, and responsible situation.

I cannot here enter far into these complex and yet so wonderfully rational and clearly defined problems, but all initiates, serious theosophists, and spiritualists, as well as the many who have intuitions amounting to recollection of former lives, know that this is the rule, though it sometimes happens that young, unformed, and inexperienced souls are placed in positions to which they are absolutely unequal, and that high and noble souls, who have in many lives, through fierce trials, eliminated all bad instincts, appear in the humblest situations amongst the most squalid surroundings.

These latter are souls that have accepted missions, and they work by levelling up, by lifting the young souls that surround them into the clear atmosphere of duty, content, and harmony.

Many will certainly urge that as we cast our eyes over the higher social sphere there are a great many souls not fit for their positions. This is because the higher the soul rises, the more is asked of it, and it takes a very long time, almost countless incarnations, to perfect a soul.

Not only the very highest qualities of a soul have to be considered, but also the secondary ones, which are chiefly required to round off and lubricate, if I may be allowed to use this term, the higher ones. Some of these secondary qualities are culture, courtesy, grace, appreciation, gentleness, perception, tact, &c. Though these qualities stand on the second line below truth, justice, moral courage, generosity, and unselfishness, they are slow and difficult to learn, and are eminently the attribute of older souls, who sometimes acquire them before they are well grounded in the higher virtues, which give their proper value to the secondary ones. We must, therefore, as we mount up in the social scale, be prepared to meet as many imperfections as we make up our mind to accept amongst what I would like to call the younger orders, only that the imperfections of the latter are generally of another kind and on another level.

If it could be impressed upon the consciousness of nations that it is not a question of higher or lower orders, but of older and younger souls, and that it lies in everybody's power to continually improve

their position, how much heartburning, bitterness, and misunderstanding, how much sorrow and misery would be eliminated !

The older souls would then remember that they also, in dim ages long gone by, have suffered and slaved through lives of pain and misery, lives probably far exceeding in horrors those of their younger brethren, who have been born into days of greater justice and less cruelty, in a world which is constantly exerting itself to relieve them in every way.

If older souls would always remember the elementary state of the younger ones, they would not be impatient with their want of understanding, as they often are at present, but hold out a guiding hand and watch over them, firmly keeping them to their work and their duty, so as to give them the best chance of advancing and bettering themselves in another incarnation.

No tearing down of social distinctions, no nationalising of private property or distribution of money can benefit the younger souls. They are artificial devices which, instead of helping them, only endanger their future welfare. Souls only grow by their own efforts or great trials and sorrows.

The surest way to advance for all souls is constant, conscientious, and harmonious work. St. Francis of Assisi, that holiest and most inspired of saints, who so often has lifted up for mortal eyes a corner of the veil which hides the hereafter, has truly said :

‘ Work is a prayer that lifts up the soul to God.’

Even if politics were not what they are, and Ministers were not the slaves of majorities, it is doubtful whether any laws could be framed to make a people happy, unless they were prepared for their reception.

As things are now in almost every country, the greater the advance towards so-called Socialism, the less the liberty, the less the happiness. The home is the cradle of a nation’s prosperity, and all legislation now tends towards its destruction. Nothing is done to instruct the great masses in the simplest rules of hygiene and to teach them to prefer nourishing wholemeal bread to the atrocious compound they eat, and pure milk to the bitter and poisonous tea which they imbibe ; and yet things like these go to the very roots of a nation’s happiness, and to legislate for them is true Socialism, for it means the prosperity of all. A great and patriotic Government ought to care about these things, and be able to look further than the votes they hope to catch.

The all-important question is not how to create the happiness of a certain person, or a certain class, but to distribute as much happiness as possible into the whole country, the whole world. This cannot be obtained by any particular theories, not even by Socialism or Anarchism put into practice ; indeed, the latter being absolutely destructive, it positively withdraws great elements of happiness from

the masses, when, on the contrary, everybody's aim ought to be to build up and create as much prosperity and contentment as possible.

Socialism is a fallacy because it is impracticable. It is, like death, not a state, but only a door through which you pass. It cannot become a state of things, because its basis for ever shifts, and it would be the greatest misfortune to mankind if it could become a state, as it would mean a return to the early uncivilised beginnings of mankind. It would mean complete stagnation, a paralysis of private enterprise, the disappearance of private charity, and not only the levelling of fortunes, but also the sweeping away of everything beautiful, high and noble; a sordid existence and an absolute bar to advance of any kind.

When the theory of Reincarnation becomes better understood by the great masses, they will see that it is the individual effort alone which advances the soul, so that in another life it can take a higher place. There is no good in pushing on artificially people into positions they are not fit or ready to take, and which they cannot fill with dignity to themselves or profit to others, whilst in some simpler walk of life they might have recognised the necessity of effort, and adversity would have strengthened their character and developed their higher qualities.

We see this in people as in nations, and it would be easy to cite many examples when decline and corruption set in because prosperity came too soon, and before the temper and the character of the individual or the nation had been sufficiently steeled and purified by effort and adversity.

A high position inadequately filled means a relapse and punishment in future incarnations.

It is curious that often those who suffer greatly in this world, apparently through no fault of their own, seldom complain, because they have a vague feeling that somehow their misfortunes are deserved. This is no original remark of mine, but one often made by the greatest authorities on occult matters.

The feeling that he is paying for faults committed in another incarnation makes the sufferer bear his pain with resignation, and accept it as a step in the soul's advance.

Reincarnation teaches resignation, that most dignified of qualities, without which we cannot rise into higher spheres.

It is only natural that those who believe that one short span of life in the body is the only chance they will ever have, are discontented and often distracted and despairing if their lot is not a happy one, and also that those who have thoroughly enjoyed themselves are equally unhappy at the thought that they will never have such a good time again. Neither of them can be resigned.

The happy ones, on the contrary, who have grasped the wonderful

mystery of Reincarnation, who know that chance succeeds chance, that no effort is wasted, that everything they acquire is laid in store for them, know that it depends on themselves alone to make their lives more and more happy, elevated, and useful.

It is the endless complexity of the great secret of Reincarnation which makes it so difficult to explain in all its details and apparent contradictions. Many souls have intuitively accepted it, as a great truth, which has suddenly changed the whole tenor of their lives, and they do not try to explain a thing, which in their inmost hearts they 'know.'

This is the same with all religions, but Reincarnation is not a religion, as many think. It is simply the discovery of a fact which gives a clearer, deeper insight into religion, and into all the unseen springs of life. Those who are so far advanced that they begin to remember the acquisitions of former lives will have the world at their feet.

All great poets, writers, and artists belong to that class, as well as men and women who distinguish themselves in other ways, but wonderful insight into their past is sometimes found amongst the very humble and uneducated, in our modern acceptance of this word. This means generally that some mission or task has been entrusted to them, a mission to the young and lowly souls with whom they are surrounded and whose consciousness they can better reach by being in that outward humble condition.

These missions explain to us many mysteries of noble and highly refined souls in the most incongruous surroundings. Such souls often become martyrs to some great cause, not as a punishment to themselves but as an example to young and elemental ones.

The masses are generally composed of young souls, who by work and the rub of life have to shape themselves or rather get shaped into something better. Many have gone through this phase as slaves, perhaps in the ancient world, or even in times of which the very existence is forgotten, and some of these may even now have passed on to a less sorrowful star than ours is. Those who have lived, suffered and worked most are generally those who, their experience reaching through many æons, unconscious or rather subconscious though it may be, rise or are born to responsible positions. It does, however, not unfrequently happen that young souls attain great power, often as a scourge. Such were Attila, Ivan the Terrible, and many others who reigned through sheer brutality and with the fierceness of the tiger. When, as in the French Revolution, it happens that many younger souls get the upper hand, it becomes a national misfortune, and France has never recovered from the damage they did. Younger souls are endowed with an elemental impetus and directness of purpose, an animal indifference to destruction which invests them with a fatal power and strength, seldom possessed by old and tempered souls,

who have a wide horizon and are restrained by thousands of considerations and memories of the past.

The elemental soul has no reverence or affection for the past. As long as it attains its immediate object, it cares nothing for the pain, ruin and sorrow of others. Look at the bomb outrages. They are absolutely useless. But they are an *idée fixe* of the elemental soul, and must be perpetrated though numbers of innocents are maimed and killed. The *pétroleuses* during the Commune were only elemental souls excited and let loose. They burnt the half of Paris, they did not know why, just for the joy of destruction.

It was said during the Russo-Japanese War that the reason why the latter achieved such wonderful successes was their belief in Reincarnation, which endowed them with the recollection of the experiences of other lives and pointed out to them the right way, clearing up situations which otherwise appeared inextricable.

However this may be, it is quite certain that their belief in Reincarnation inspired the Japanese during those troublous times with a courage, a resignation, a calm hitherto unrivalled under such circumstances. It was the consequence of a teaching impressed for thousands of years on souls whose aim it must always be to do their very best in every circumstance. Some authorities say that the Japanese are the only race of pure Atlanteans left in the world.

If this be so, we may surmise that they derive their belief in Reincarnation from those ancestors, those giants in mind and body, who wrought their portentous rise and tremendous fall by the powers they acquired through the recollection of the accumulated experiences of successive lives.

If Reincarnation were understood in the Western world, as it is in some parts of the East, how many social problems would be solved at once! If, instead of setting up the fetish Socialism, which really means to the masses that the diligent and clever should work for the lazy and stupid ones, these agitators would press the Government to make laws which would improve the physical capacity of the younger generation, and by this, their material prosperity, they would render a real service to Socialism. The unemployed are not a problem difficult to solve, it is the unemployable which we breed in greater masses every day, which swamp the country.

Instead of spending the nation's money in tying wretched little children down to desks to learn a lot of unnecessary things, besides the few necessary ones, which they could with facility master in three months when they are older, would it not be far better Socialism to teach the boys trades by which they could live, and girls their home duties, of which the present generation are entirely ignorant?

It is a well-known fact that in countries where school attendance is not rigorously enforced, all the best workmen and the best servants are illiterate. Those who understand Reincarnation will easily grasp

the reason for this. The young soul which has no previous store of knowledge has to learn everything from the beginning, and gets all its powers absorbed away by the mental work of school; nothing remains to spare for the handicraft or trade by which they are to live. The more headwork for children, the worse workmen a nation will have.

If girls were taught to cook, to sweep, to wash, to iron, to make their own clothes, their husbands' and their children's, to turn their hands to everything, to leave their houses simple, but to make them bright and healthy, what cheerfulness and harmony would fill the world! To create a perfect home, within whatever limits it may be, is what gives woman unlimited power, far greater than the rights they are so noisily clamouring for at present. It is impossible to obtain anything by making oneself ridiculous, and they have alienated the sympathies even of those who were well disposed to their cause. The foreign papers alluding to the suffragettes have an inkling of where the shoe pinches, and funnily say:

“ ‘Of course they are all plain and badly dressed.’

If, instead of making this useless *tapage*, these ladies would devote themselves to nursing their babies, they would deserve well of their country, as successive generations of cow-fed infants will surely not improve the intellect of the nation. Later on all responsibilities are shuffled off on to school masters and mistresses, and the only thing the modern woman still seems to attend to, and that only in a kind of half-hearted way, as the latest returns of the birth-rate show, is bringing the children into the world.

Socialism, as it has been preached for some time, has thrown weak minds off their balance. The question is not in what position a man or woman is, but how perfectly they fill it. A milkmaid in wooden pattens and with bare arms, who understands her business and does her duty honestly and conscientiously, is far above a lady who, though she may be a great one in name, wastes her time in doing nothing. The one will arrive to perfection in her sphere and thus attain a great rise in a future existence, whilst the other one will relapse into the regions from which she emerged too soon into a life in which she mistook ease for laziness and wealth for luxury.

In Italy it is the common expression of the poor to say ‘far il Signore,’ which is synonymous for doing nothing. What a decadence of energy, ambition and ideals does this phrase disclose! Are we standing on the brink of the same abyss in England?

Gigantic sums are daily spent by public benefactors. If all that money had been properly adapted, surely there would not be one pauper in the country. Nowhere does private charity do as much, and yet the poor-rates get higher and higher and paupers more and more. It is not only the wasteful administration of these vast sums which is the cause, but the very destination of many of these bequests

tends to increase the mischief. Take for instance the millions Mr. Carnegie has spent on public libraries, over which I am told he does not even exercise a control in the choice of the books, and of which the masses only read the most useless and frivolous part. To encourage the taste for light literature does direct harm to the young. It debilitates their minds and incapacitates them for work and exertion.

It is sufficient to see when travelling, young boys and girls, even in third-class compartments, with armfuls of illustrated papers and magazines, to understand where their money goes and what makes them so useless and inefficient. Any form of manual labour is better for young souls than deviating their weak and unformed powers into useless reading.

Division of property is of course a childish device, but it is everybody's duty to put their shoulder to the wheel, to do what lies in their power to increase the happiness of those around them.

Every man and woman who create something good or great with their brains or their hands are Socialists, for the idea, the invention, is spread and given away and seized upon by others, who make it their own, by giving it the impress of their minds.

Those who have no brains or clever hands, but have other possessions, such as fine houses, pictures, parks, &c., also act in the socialistic sense if they allow others a view and enjoyment of these things. It must not be forgotten that they have the care, the expense, the responsibility and troubles such possessions entail, and that those who come to see them have the pleasure only.

Those who wish to destroy such private possessions do not remember that they put nothing in their place, and that everything would thus be reduced to a hideous and miserable dead level.

Such feelings are often dictated by jealousy and want of reflection, which are qualities naturally inherent to young souls, and it is on these qualities that the agitators play.

England is the country where such ideas have taken the least root up to this time, principally, and rightly so, because up to now Englishmen have looked upon themselves as the finest fellows in the world, and therefore the canker of jealousy has not gnawed so much at their vitals as at those of less fortunate and younger nations.

Modern theories are, however, undermining this wholesome self-assurance. Instead of the nation being proud of being the greatest power in the world and gladly assuming its responsibilities towards its colonies and dependencies and all the unformed and elemental souls of the wild tribes under its dominion, a responsibility which it is far more fit to discharge than any other nation, it is now taught that it is better to creep back into its former little shell, only to think of its own interests and give up helping others.

Instead of forcing impractical socialistic theories on the people,

theories which if put into practice could only end in a general game of grab and Anarchism, would it not be a much higher and nobler aim to interest them in the welfare of our vast Empire, in the protection of young and struggling communities and the civilising of hardly evolved races, a task for which no other nation is yet ripe ?

To ensure the prosperity of the greatest Empire the world has yet seen, that would indeed be true and really grand Socialism.

WALBURGA PAGET.

THE READING OF THE COLONIAL GIRL

IN February last Miss Florence B. Low contributed to this Review an article, a jeremiad it might be called, on 'The Reading of the Modern Girl.' Many who read that article, especially such as were still young enough clearly to remember their own school-days, must have felt that if this fairly represented the intellectual level of the girl of to-day, then there was a great difference between her and the girl of yesterday, and, they hoped, the girl of to-morrow. It happened that among the most interested readers of Miss Low's paper were certain colonially educated women. It might be true of English girls, they admitted, but surely, unless things were very much changed in a very few years, it could not be true of the girls in the best Colonial high schools.

This suggested trying to find out what the girls in as many as possible of our Colonies and dependencies really do read, and in what direction their tastes lie. To this end the unique opportunities and knowledge of the League of the Empire were utilised. This society exists for the purpose of furthering the federation of the Empire in education, and one branch of its work is the 'linking,' so to speak, of two schools of similar grade in different parts of the Empire for exchange and comparison of descriptive letters, essays, or other work. One school is generally, though not always, in Great Britain, and the other in India or in some Colony. As the League has now branches and representatives in every part of the Empire, from India to Barbados, and from Canada to Malta, it is in touch with a great variety of schools. A new list of questions was drawn up on a much more liberal basis, I venture to think, than the list the replies to which drew forth Miss Low's lament on the decay of culture in the modern girl. The following were the questions sent out :

1. What books do you read for recreation ?
2. Which novels have you read of the following writers :—Scott, Thackeray, Dickens, Kingsley ?
3. Of the following living novelists :—Meredith, Kipling, Rider Haggard, Gilbert Parker, Conan Doyle, Barrie ?
4. Name any novels you have read by the following women writers :—George Eliot, Jane Austen, Charlotte Brontë.
5. Name any novels that interest you by other writers than these.

6. Which English classics do you like best?
7. Which poets?
8. What are your favourite poems?
9. What is your favourite study? What books do you read in connection with it?
10. What is your favourite hobby? What books do you read in connection with it?
11. Do the daily or weekly newspapers interest you? If so, what parts?
12. Which of the monthly magazines do you read?

As Miss Low's remarks only applied to British high-school girls between the ages of fifteen and eighteen, it was only colonial high-school girls between those ages who were asked to fill up the forms. All these answers have naturally taken some months to collect. Moreover, partly because it was felt that perhaps the modern English girl had been too hastily condemned, and partly because it was thought that a few comparisons would be interesting, hundreds of papers were sent out to British high schools, among them some of the best standing.

It will be seen that the League of the Empire questions afford much more scope than Miss Low's for individual tastes. Those who drafted them were specially anxious to draw out a girl's general intelligence. If she had any strong bent, any serious tastes, she was given every opportunity of exhibiting them. Of course it is not fair to judge a girl's intelligence and capability on her reading alone; on going through all these papers that was most forcibly brought before me. Many a girl whose answers to questions 2, 3, 4 and even 5 were poor, was yet obviously not unintelligent. Her tastes did not lie in the direction of reading standard authors. Sometimes she was distinctly musical, and read the lives of composers; or she might have a strong bent towards nature-study and read *The Countryside*, *The Field*, *Country Life*, and the works of Ernest Seton Thompson, while on her country walks in search of specimens she might even take as a companion Mr. E. V. Lucas's *The Open Road*. But for all that she might have small Scott and less Thackeray. Or she might very well be a girl of artistic tastes, and read Ruskin, *The Studio*, or artists' lives.

The many hundreds of papers I examined only bore out Miss Low's conclusions up to a certain point, even so far as British girls are concerned. Miss Low's girls often 'could not read' Jane Austen; but judging from the papers I have gone through, it is safe to say that the more intelligent girls have generally read three or four of hers, and often five or six, sometimes all. Even girls of fifteen have often had a very creditable record as regards Jane Austen.

'Mrs. Ewing they hardly knew.' I am sorry to say I have seen nothing to controvert this statement of Miss Low's. At any rate, Mrs. Ewing is rarely mentioned, whether by a Colonial or by a British girl, but when she is mentioned, it is usually by a girl of exceptional intelligence and taste. A Barbados girl mentioned *Jackanapes* and

Ann of the Windmill, and a South Australian girl 'many' of Mrs. Ewing's books. Of another graceful writer I found no mention either—Mrs. Gatty—except in the case of one girl whose tastes were evidently for animals rather than for books, but who read *Parables from Nature* along with books on cats, cat-keeping being her favourite hobby.

'Nor,' Miss Low continues, 'in a much lower category,' did they know Miss Alcott. This statement I have found confirmed with regard to British girls' reading, though even as I write a new edition of *Little Women* and its sister books is announced as out; but the Colonial girls' papers gave a diametrically opposite result.' In them Miss Alcott is a good second in the list of most frequently mentioned writers, sometimes one, sometimes another, sometimes all the *Little Women* series being put down as favourites.

'Mrs. Gaskell seems to find few girl readers.' Among the better-read British girls whose papers I went through, she finds a great many. She comes seventh out of a list of ten most read authors, though it is nearly always *Cranford* which is named. Once or twice I have found *Mary Barton* or *Wives and Daughters* mentioned, but *Sylvia's Lovers* never. Perhaps the Knutsford edition may remedy this. Colonials, however, it would seem, read Mrs. Gaskell very little.

But in judging and drawing inferences from papers like these, two facts must always be borne in mind. As regards their reading, girls evidently tend to follow one another rather like sheep. In one school one author will be highly popular. Nearly every girl will mention one or more of his or her books. In another school, perhaps in the same town, or same colony, and similar in grade, the same author will hardly once be referred to. Also, Colonial high schools are inevitably much more mixed than British high schools. Yet Colonial girls whose opportunities may fairly be compared with those of their British sisters, are usually quite as well read for their ages, and they generally read far fewer 'girls' books. The general averages of the Colonial girls' papers are greatly pulled down and their net results much affected because several Indian schools are included with native girls whose knowledge of English is not perfect enough for them to be well read, and because also several South African schools sending in papers have a considerable element of Dutch girls or girls brought up in such conditions as to have had no chance of gratifying a taste for reading and little of forming one.

The bright climates and open-air life of many Colonies, and the fact that most Colonial girls have to take a turn in domestic work of one kind or another, often militate against their spending very much of their leisure over books. A young Colony has rarely a literary atmosphere, though everyone well acquainted with Colonial life must have noticed how surprisingly well-read many Colonials are, notwithstanding. The mistress of a Natal school says that very often when

a girl comes to her school 'she has read nothing; her leisure has been spent out of doors. But every year,' she adds, 'is making a difference in this Colony; the average girl of 1906 reads far more than the average girl of 1895.'

Inevitably girls tend to read either classics constantly alluded to, such as *Oliver Twist*, *Pickwick*, *Nicholas Nickleby*, *Vanity Fair*, *Pendennis*, *The Heart of Midlothian* and others of the Waverley Novels, *The Vicar of Wakefield* and *The Pilgrim's Progress*, or simply books of the day that they hear talked about. Writers like Miss Thackeray or Miss Mulock (Mrs. Craik), rather old-fashioned and hardly classics, they are much more likely to neglect. I cannot remember to have found a single allusion to Miss Thackeray by a girl in any part of the Empire. *John Halifax, Gentleman*, seems much read by Colonials, and certainly not forgotten by British girls; but there was no mention of any other of Mrs. Craik's works.

Certain results of these papers were surprising. One would have expected *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking-glass* to have been more often mentioned. Colonials include them among their favourite books far oftener than British girls. On the other hand, it was good to find that many of the better-read girls mentioned *The Vicar of Wakefield*, and that R. L. Stevenson finds so many readers, and not only of his novels. In the best Colonial papers his works are generally much to the fore, and Scotch girls are particularly loyal to him. Dumas figures quite prominently in the best British girls' papers; and there is even occasional mention of Balzac, Daudet and Victor Hugo, while one fifteen-year-old maiden has read *Lourdes*. Charles Reade is often mentioned (though nearly always *It is Never too Late to Mend*), and Blackmore quite often, though comparatively seldom any of his works but *Lorna Doone*. Marie Corelli comes ninth on the list of the British girls' favourite authors; and seventh on the Colonial girls' list; but it must be admitted that in the best papers she generally takes a very back seat. Miss Yonge figures far more prominently than might have been expected, especially considering Miss Low's remarks. In the Colonial girls' list she is above Marie Corelli, and is very often cited by English girls also.

It is not surprising that few girls, British or Colonial, mention such writers as Gissing, Mr. H. G. Wells, Mr. Henry James, or Mr. Robert Hichens, and not very many name any of Mrs. Humphry Ward's books. But it might have been expected, especially considering the remarkable popularity of gardening and other hobbies connected with flowers, that *Elizabeth and her German Garden* and the other *Elizabeth* books would have been often mentioned, but it only very rarely happens that this is so. I have sought in vain for a mention of Jean Ingelow's stories (*Studies for Stories*, *A Sister's Bye-hours* and other collections). One Barbados girl speaks of her poems, and that is all. Nor was any mention to be found of the

delightful works of the late Miss Anne Manning, *The Household of Sir Thomas More*, *The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell*, afterwards *Mistress Milton*, *The Old Chelsea Bun-house*, and others, some of them happily now being reprinted. It is certainly a pity that two such graceful writers as Jean Ingelow and Anne Manning should be neglected, and surely this matters much more than that Mrs. Craik and Miss Thackeray should be little read.

These papers have naturally revealed certain general differences between the British and the Colonial girl. Undoubtedly, as already hinted, the Colonial is usually the older for her years. When sixteen and seventeen, she tends to put away such girlish things as Mrs. L. T. Meade, for instance, and long before this age of discretion she usually scorns girls' magazines. Speaking from recollection, few, if any, of the girls of even fifteen at my own Colonial school but would have scorned them also. Numbers of English girls, however, of sixteen and a half, seventeen, seventeen and a half, almost eighteen, do not seem to do so. The Colonial has a stronger preference even than the British girl for boys' stories, especially boys' school stories, which seem even more delightful than girls' school stories, and *The Hill*, Mr. Vachell's interesting story of Harrow life, has found many girl readers all over the world; while *Tom Brown's Schooldays* is still popular as ever. The Colonial girl is also devoted to adventure books, often of the hair-breadth escape, somewhat bloodcurdling order. This tendency is especially noticeable in the South Africans, and it is a problem for students of the influence of environment whether the veldt may not have something to do with this.

One thing is very marked—a Colonial girl usually mentions a great many more books in her answers to questions 1 and 5 than her British sister troubles to do. Constantly the Colonial girl's list in 5 stretches over-page and far away down the back of her answer sheet in small writing.

Considering that they live in lands with no history in the English sense of the word, Colonial girls seem remarkably fond of historical—some unkind folk would call them pseudo-historical—novels. History is also very often their favourite study.

Colonial girls have generally a laudable tendency to patronise local industry by reading the works of Colonial novelists, especially such as deal with their own Colony. With the Australian girls, for instance, Ethel Turner is immensely popular; and other Australian novelists, such as Rolf Boldrewood and Guy Boothby, with a goodly proportion of Americans such as Booth Tarkington and 'Mrs. Wiggs' of cabbage-patch fame, Owen Wister, Winston Churchill, and Ralph Connor, are also popular. Among the writers mentioned by Canadian girls, it is hardly surprising to find a still larger proportion of Americans, Ralph Connor, Hawthorne, Mark Twain, L. M. Alcott, Frank Norris, Winston Churchill, and Kate Douglas Wiggin

preponderating. Indeed, one seventeen-year-old Canadian, answering question 1, says: *Mrs. Wiggs, Lovey Mary, Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm, The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come, To Have and to Hold, The Masquerader, The Pit, The Call of the Wild, Calumet K., Three Men in a Boat*. That is, almost entirely Colonial and American books. Ernest Seton Thompson finds favour not only with Canadians, but with many English girls with a taste for natural history.

The Indian and Cingalese girls are much the youngest set, and often under age; which accounts for their reading far more 'story books' and children's books, such as *Hesba Stretton's* and the *Pansy* and *Elsie* Series, than any other set of girls. They, however, alone mention Colonel Meadows Taylor's Indian tales. Most of these girls were still young enough to enjoy such old favourites as *The Wide Wide World*, *Stepping Heavenward*, and *The Lamplighter*, and such writers as Mrs. Meade and Rosa N. Carey, and, it is good to be able to add, Lewis Carroll. A fair comparison, however, with other girls in the Colonies or Great Britain is very hard to institute. One paper, tolerably good for fifteen years, and extremely candid, came from Hong-Kong. 'No time for hobbies, too many lessons,' is the answer to question 10; and 'not fond of studying anything for long,' the frank avowal in reply to question 9.

A number of interesting papers came from Barbados, mentioning a very varied selection mostly of modern books, but with a fair proportion of the approved old favourites such as Miss Yonge's stories.

Coming to the different questions in detail, the South African girls, who are often country bred and of Dutch descent, show a strong preference for history and adventure. No girls mention so many historical novels, and many of them are well read in Scott, one recording twenty-four! One young lady of fifteen informs us: 'My reading is of a varied kind. According to the mood I happen to be in, I read light novels, Dickens, books of travel and adventure, biographies, poems, and plays, &c.' A great many American authors are mentioned here also—American writers for some years past seem to have been becoming more and more popular in the Colonies. *The Story of a South African Farm*, however, is rarely, if ever, cited. The novels mentioned by the South Africans are so various, that beyond noting the large number of girls' books, historical tales, and adventure and school stories, it is very difficult to generalise. Henty figures pre-eminently, but the girls, as a rule, are rather young as compared with the British girls.

Some of the New Zealand girls' papers were equal to the very best English or Scotch, and the varied nature of their reading was astonishing. No girls, perhaps, showed quite so much variety in their choice of authors.

In question 2, Dickens is certainly the most widely read novelist, whether in Great Britain or in any of the Colonies. But the long lists

Of Scott's works to the credit of almost all the well-read and intelligent girls of the Empire, would delight the heart of Mr. Andrew Lang. Sometimes *all* Scott is mentioned. Kingsley is also very much read on the whole, especially *The Water Babies*, *The Heroes*, and *Westward Ho!* Thackeray is naturally the least read by girls, who seem generally to begin with *Vanity Fair*. On the whole, the evidence goes to show that, as far as standard novelists go, whenever the Colonial girl comes from at all literary surroundings, she certainly does not neglect them.

Coming to the living authors asked about (question 3), very few girls, British or Colonial, have read any works by Mr. Meredith, and a sad number confuse him with the late Henry Seton Merriman. When Mr. Meredith has been read at all, it is generally *Diana of the Crossways*, *Rhoda Fleming*, or *One of Our Conquerors*. Girls extremely well read, otherwise, have not ventured upon him, however. The Colonial gives most votes to Mr. Rider Haggard; but Mr. Rudyard Kipling is very little behind in popularity, and, perhaps, if some of the girls were more certain about their authors, he would not be behind at all. Next in order of popularity is Sir Conan Doyle—a good third; while Mr. J. M. Barrie is a very poor fourth, hardly getting a sixth of Sir Conan Doyle's votes. Canada alone has saved Sir Gilbert Parker's novels from the bottom place; without her help, even Mr. Meredith would have scored more heavily. Mr. Kipling's *Just-So Stories* and *Kim* are, perhaps, the most popular of his works. Mr. Rider Haggard's books seem fairly equally read, but Sir Conan Doyle's immense popularity with girls, whether in Great Britain or in the Colonies, certainly rests chiefly on the Sherlock Holmes series.

This article professedly deals with the reading of the Colonial girl, yet the extent to which she tends to gang her own gait can hardly be gauged without some comparisons. Therefore, without being sent back to my sheep again, I hope I may say that among British girls the most popular of these five living novelists are Sir Conan Doyle, Mr. Kipling, and Mr. Rider Haggard. There is really little apparent difference in their popularity; but if the best papers only were judged, Mr. Kipling would come out first. Mr. J. M. Barrie is much more read by British than by Colonial girls, for whom he is probably both too Scotch and too sentimental. In Scotland and in the north of England, however, he had enough votes to rank him fourth, but a very bad fourth, again hardly getting one-sixth as much mention as Sir Conan Doyle. Mr. Meredith's works head all the others in point of number in one answer only, and then the paper is that of a girl of nearly eighteen, whose answers show her to be exceptional.

As to the three great women novelists, among the Colonials George Eliot comes easily first, and Jane Austen a very fair third. Generally, it is *The Mill on the Floss*, *Pride and Prejudice*, and *Jane Eyre*, that

are the most read. *Jane Eyre* particularly is everywhere, both in Great Britain and the Colonies, the favourite of Charlotte Brontë's novels, though *Shirley* and *Villette* are very often mentioned.

To one great blot on many girls' papers I do not remember Miss Low's referring—haziness, about authors. Considering all things, English (I purposely do not say British) girls are worse in this respect than Colonial. So inaccurate are they, that it is very often difficult to know what they really have read. For instance, a girl says she has read nothing of Jane Austen's, and presently she is found putting down two of her books to George Eliot! Of course, in the really good papers there is very little attributing of books to their wrong authors, but there are far too many girls of sixteen and seventeen putting down Jane Austen's works to Miss Yonge, for instance, and making other absolutely wild guesses. There is, as said before, constant confusion by English and Colonial alike of two entirely dissimilar authors—Meredith and Merriman. And though fifteen and three-quarters from a Dutch farm or from the Canadian backwoods might be, perhaps, excused, for writing *Dombey House* and *Little Dot*, or for confusing Mr. Kipling and Mr. E. W. Hornung, it is not excusable when she comes from a British school with a world-wide reputation, nor can *The Bishop of Wakefield* be allowed to pass from sixteen, also attending a famous British high school. Of course, Colonials do perpetrate 'howlers' with regard to authors, but not worse 'howlers' than those of their British sisters, and though they tend to be more shaky about authors, the very shaky ones are generally able to plead extenuating circumstances, which could not be pleaded by any British girls. *The Vale of Cedars* (Aguilar) put down to Scott; *The Dove in the Eagle's Nest* to Kingsley; *The Light that Failed* fathered first on Thackeray and then on Dickens, before finally Mr. Kipling is settled on; *The Lilac Sunbonnet*, attributed to George Eliot; some of Jane Austen's novels credited to Thackeray, and *Ships that Pass in the Night* to Sir Conan Doyle, are all from girls brought up in utterly unliterary surroundings, and can all be equalled, if not excelled, by instances of carelessness taken from English girls' answers.

Sometimes, of course, Colonial papers show bad spelling; but, as a rule, this is not the case. After going through a number of papers, many of them shockingly ill-spelt, in fact positively illiterate, from a British high school, which, however, I trust and believe is, though famous, not typical, it was most refreshing to come upon a batch of Australian papers, and find girls of sixteen and seventeen able to spell 'Prejudice' (*Pride and Prejudice*) not only correctly, but correctly the first time—surely, not such a very wonderful accomplishment, not half so wonderful as the many ways in which Sweet Sixteen and Sweet Seventeen at English schools managed to misspell this simple word. 'Preduce,' 'predjuice,' 'predjudice,' 'perjuice'—I have found them all and many more. And seventeen years and ten months,

after several attempts and much scratching out, can only achieve 'prejudice!' 'Sensibility' brought many to the ground, and even so humble a word as 'sense' proved a stumbling-block and rock of offence unto several. No Colonial papers were so bad in this respect.

Coming to proper names, there is everywhere too much 'Dickins,' 'Jane Austin,' and 'George Elliott,' and naturally 'Anne of Geierstein' caused much searching of evidently fickle memories. But the Colonial, I think, has always the advantage in the homely and very necessary accomplishment of spelling.

Too many girls, but not so many Colonials proportionately, make 'rattle-pated' replies. When asked, for instance, 'Which novels have you read of the following authors?' they include a number of poems in their answers; and many evidently do not know what is meant either by 'classics' or by 'monthly magazines.' In answering question 12 they mention a great number of weekly periodicals; and in answering question 6 (English classics) they include some writers who certainly are not, and almost as certainly never will be, classics.

Perhaps the answers to questions 5 and 6 give a better notion than any others of a girl's general intelligence and the diversity of her reading. The most varied books are mentioned, some of them, one would think, much above the comprehension of their readers. One sixteen-year-old girl, for instance, mentions Horace Walpole's *Letters*, Butler's *Analogy*, *The Wealth of Nations*, and eleven poets, including Herrick, Herbert, Adelaide Procter, and Kingsley.

Novels, historical and otherwise, mostly by living and too often by flimsy writers, naturally largely preponderate in the replies to question 5. This is true whether girls from Great Britain or from the Colonies are considered. But Stevenson, Charles Lamb's *Essays*, *Cranford*, and *The Vicar of Wakefield* are all frequently mentioned as read by choice, be it observed. George MacDonald is commonly cited by Scotch girls, rarely by Colonials; Marion Crawford's *Sarcinesca* trilogy is still very popular, and there are many signs that Besant everywhere finds his share of girl readers. Plays are very rarely included by any girl in the list of her favourite books.

Broadly speaking, in questions 5 and 6, the best British and the best Colonial papers show about the same width and diversity of reading, but a higher proportion of the Colonial papers are really good. Personally, I should certainly be inclined to consider the ordinary British high-school girl more widely read than Miss Low does. Certainly the Colonial girls' papers, where they can be fairly compared with those of British high-school girls, yield results very different from those animadverted upon by her. Sometimes, of course, a girl mentions Milton or Browning when, judging from the rest of her paper, one feels sure that there is very little of either of those poets that she would appreciate or understand, but, generally speaking, the papers bear the most obvious marks of sincerity. Apart

from Shakespeare, Scott, Macaulay's essays, Wordsworth, Goldsmith, Gray, and the other works read as 'school' classics, and, therefore, very often set down, there is frequent mention of Browning and Mrs. Browning, Moore, the *Canterbury Tales* (this probably only because they are often read in selections in schools), Byron, and particularly Longfellow, evidently one of the average girl's favourite poets. Bacon's and Addison's names often appear; more rarely Ruskin's, Carlyle's (*The French Revolution* or his *Essays*). *The Pilgrim's Progress* is everywhere often mentioned. Keats is highly popular among the poets, and it is everywhere noticeable that poetry and essays predominate. Milton, especially the shorter poems, and Shakespeare's plays are so often mentioned that it can hardly be always merely due to reading them in school. Matthew Arnold, Sheridan, Thomas Love Peacock, George Borrow, Rossetti, Pope, and 'Omar Khayyam' are common favourites if rather the pick of the girls are selected; otherwise they are comparatively rarely alluded to. Australian girls read Adam Lindsay Gordon and A. B. Paterson. Except Shakespeare's plays, drama is very rarely mentioned.

In poetry Tennyson is undoubtedly easily first in point of popularity, but Longfellow is not a bad second. It is chiefly Tennyson's short, early poems, such as *The May Queen*, *Enoch Arden*, *The Lady of Shalott*, and *The Idylls of the King*, *Maud*, and *The Princess* that are mentioned. The British girl seems just as fond of Tennyson as her Colonial sister, and it is very rare to find a paper from any part of the Empire with no mention of Tennyson either under English classics or under poets. None of the girls answering question 6 seem to have reflected that Longfellow, Lowell, Holmes, and Whittier, though classics in a sense, are certainly not *English* classics, which is all they are asked about.

Whether because bad poetry is to most people far more mortally tedious than bad prose, it is very rarely that an inferior poem—question 8—is mentioned with approval by a girl. The *Ancient Mariner* has many votes, as have Keats's and Shelley's shorter poems, though *Enoch Arden*, *The Idylls of the King*, *The Lady of the Lake*, *Hiawatha*, and *Evangeline* are perhaps most often mentioned. Australians are appealed to by *The Man from Snowy River* and *The Sick Stockrider*, and by the somewhat noisy notes of *Admirals All* and the *Recessional*. The results, so far as I can judge, are that many girls tend to be better read in poetical than in prose classics.

Miss Low complained greatly of the excessive magazine reading of English girls. This, I should say, was generally not so bad as she thinks. Many girls certainly do seem to read too many rubbishy magazines, and so many girls of sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen read avowedly girls' magazines for "which they are really growing much too old; but the Colonial girl seems a more inveterate magazine reader than the British girl, and in this respect the Indian girls are

the worst, many of them reading ten to fifteen a month. In the English girls' papers I find very often one, two, three, four, and even 'nought' put down as the answer to question 12. Rarely is it seven, nine, twelve. And though great magazine readers may have little to show in the way of serious reading, this does not always follow. 'Any I can get' is not an infrequent answer to question 12. The Colonial girls' most popular magazines are the *Strand*, and, a very long way after, the *Windsor*; a very long way after again, *Pearson's*, the *Royal*, and the *Pall Mall*. A certain proportion of the older girls read the *Nineteenth Century*, *Blackwood's*, and occasionally the *Fortnightly Review*. Excepting the Indians, the Colonial girl only reads three to three and a half magazines a month, including the weekly papers mentioned, as against the British girl's two and a half (about).

The answers as to newspaper-reading were among the most interesting. The 'Ayes had it,' and generally over and over again, whatever part of the British Empire was chosen. 'Yes, very much,' is not a rare answer, though a few girls, notably some Australians, say they are not allowed to read the papers. It is very curious how many girls say that the war news particularly interests them, especially as at the time these papers were filled in there was no war of any importance going on. Colonials are perhaps rather more warlike than British girls, but the latter tend to take the more interest in politics and Parliamentary news. Births, deaths, and marriages, weddings, and even funerals, are sometimes the chief reasons given for newspaper-reading, but this is mostly in the case of younger girls. Reviews of books are often mentioned by girls as interesting them, but, on the whole, the Colonial girl seems to read the papers for the general news of what is going on, especially on this side of the world. But she by no means neglects the sporting columns, and sometimes in the small, isolated colonies the mail and shipping news chiefly interests her. The 'woman's page,' be it noted, is hardly mentioned. One very superior New Zealand girl remarks: 'I read *Punch* regularly; we take no other weekly paper, and beyond political events the daily ones are not worth reading.'

'Girls' hobbies' scarcely come under the head of reading, and are only mentioned because the girls were asked what books they read in connection with them. Very often no book is read, but, as before said, girls with artistic tastes read the lives of artists; nature-loving girls read books and periodicals likely to help them; and one or two girls aspiring to authorship are wise enough to read Stevenson's *Art of Writing*, and any books on the English language and style they can obtain.

Few girls appear to have no hobby, and several have three or four. The Colonial girls' hobbies are so various that, beyond saying that they are more concerned with domestic pursuits than the English

girls, no general statement can be made about them. 'Girls everywhere, however, seem inclined to be very fond of gardening and flowers, and pursuits connected with flowers, such as collecting and pressing them. Old-fashioned folk may be pleased to learn that girls still exist, and very intelligent and widely read ones, too, who number embroidery, needlework, and even fancywork among their hobbies. Reading is often mentioned, and sometimes, as is evident from the rest of the paper, it is not merely reading rubbish.

To sum up. The British girls' papers that I examined by no means always bore out Miss Low's rather dismal conclusions. The Colonial girls' papers, at least in the case of those living in long-civilised colonies, and not in the 'backwoods,' bore them out still less. The inferior results as to the Colonial girls' favourite authors are due to so many country and Indian girls being included, and to their being generally a good deal younger than the British girls. Miss Low complained that girls neglected standard authors for such writers as Edna Lyall, Merriman, Anthony Hope, and, next to these, Marie Corelli, L. T. Meade, and E. E. Green. Girls certainly do read Edna Lyall very much. 'All Edna Lyall' is mentioned several times; but, then, so is 'all Dickens,' and 'all,' or 'nearly all Scott,' and even 'all Jane Austen.' With the girls belonging to certain British schools Merriman is absolutely the most popular novelist, but if a general average of votes is taken in *all* the British schools which sent in papers (many of them very well-known schools in very different parts of Great Britain), it must be admitted that Edna Lyall comes first. Careful counting and recounting of the most frequently mentioned writers gave the following results:

Favourite Novels of

<i>British Girls</i>	<i>Colonial and Indian Girls</i>
1. Edna Lyall	1. Edna Lyall
2. Henry Seton Merriman	2. Louisa M. Alcott
3. R. L. Stevenson	3. Mrs. Henry Wood
4. Stanley Weyman	4. Rosa Nouchette Carey
5. Anthony Hope	5. L. T. Meade
6. F. Marion Crawford	6. Charlotte M. Yonge
7. Mrs. Gaskell (nearly always <i>Cranford</i>)	7. Marie Corelli
8. Lytton	8. Stanley Weyman
9. Marie Corelli	9. Farrar
10. Allen Raine	10. { Lytton Henty
	CONSTANCE A. BARNICOAT.

FRANCESCO GUARDI

(1712-1793)

FRENCH Impressionism, as represented by Manet and his followers, has rendered one great service to the artistic world. It has revived public interest in four great Old Masters, and taught us to appreciate them better and to sympathise more fully with their ideals. Their names are Velasquez, Vermeer, Goya, and Guardi.

Though Guardi, the pupil of the famous Antonio Canale (mis-called Canaletto), and, by a dispensation full of interest to the biographer, the brother-in-law of the elder Tiepolo, is too well known to most of your readers to need any advocate of his already established claims as a landscape painter, there could perhaps be no more suitable moment for discussing them than the present one. From the historical point of view, the moment appears to be opportune, because Guardi ('poor' Guardi, as the Venetians are in the habit of pathetically calling him in allusion to his great hardship in his old age) has never before stood so high on the pinnacle of fame as he stands now; and it is psychologically opportune, because we are at last in possession of valuable information concerning Guardi the man, as well as concerning Guardi the painter. Until a year or two ago our knowledge of this fascinating master was confined to the two extreme links of the chain of his existence, that is, the dates of his birth and death and the name of his teacher. Through new materials, derived from the Venetian archives and other hitherto unknown sources outside Italy, which have been drawn upon for the first time, the family history of his most distinguished ancestors, his own pedigree, and individual life and some interesting episodes of his artistic career are laid bare to us, so that his personality is no longer such an enigma as that of his master still is, and the imperfect records of his existence can be pieced together. Within the limits of this article—the object of which is to draw attention to Guardi's original painter's temperament, to his environment and aims, to the various influences he came under, and to his artistic aptitude and attitude—it is, as will be readily understood, only possible to make occasional references to his history. It is not the hard struggles of his life, but the outcome of his labours

as an indefatigable, prolific painter, which we wish to dwell on. Modern painters would in vain try to equal his astounding productiveness.

There is a misconception as to Guardi's extraction, which it is of some importance at the outset to remove. The Venetians and the rest of the world have cherished the belief that Guardi, 'the greatest of Venetian landscape painters'—as an accomplished writer has described him in the *Nuova Antologia*¹—was a Venetian by birth. Guardi was of Tyrolese, that is Austrian, parentage, and Venice cannot alone claim him. His father's home was a small village, named Mastellina, which is situated in the Val di Sole, Italian Tyrol. His mother was also Austrian, and, apparently, a Viennese lady. Guardi's extraction from a mountain-bred stock like Titian's seems to account for his wonderful vitality, strength and energy. It also follows from the fact that he was not a Venetian by descent that he was not, strictly speaking, a decadent, as he is sometimes called.

As it was inevitable that Guardi, who worked at Venice throughout nearly the whole of the eighteenth century, should be influenced by his environment, the decadent taste of his contemporaries, to which certain phases of his art can be directly traced back, may be briefly recalled. When the last revival of painting occurred in Venice, after a long period of obscurity in its artistic annals, and yielded a rich harvest of talent culminating in the achievements of Tiepolo, Longhi, Carriera, Canale and Guardi, the capital itself was politically, intellectually, and morally effete. As the Venetians of the age of the Bellinis may be styled the builders of Venice, so Guardi's fellow-citizens and contemporaries may be said to have pulled the city to pieces. The Republic fell only a few years after the painter's death. The gay butterfly existence of the inhabitants of the sea-girt island, who lacked all moral fibre, cannot be better summed up than in the expressive designation 'Vita barocca.' The ultra-artificial character of the age in which Guardi lived is reflected in the artistic taste of the public, which delighted in grotesque pseudo-classical rococo architecture. It is also illustrated by the flights of Tiepolo's heated imagination and the sensationalism of the hanging arches and broken pediments in Guardi's landscapes. How far the latter sacrificed to the idol of the day by his love of ruins, a phase of art which always seems to crop up in decadent periods and which inspired Piranesi's engravings, those of your readers who are acquainted with his numerous small landscapes, which were painted for commercial purposes, will be able to judge. The discoveries at Herculaneum and Pompeii after the commencement of the second half of the eighteenth century had greatly enhanced the taste for classical remains; and it was in deference to this fashion that Guardi turned out landscape after

Nuova Antologia: 'Il più grande paesista di Venezia.'—R. Paulucci de Calboli, Roma, il 1 Settembre, 1905 (a proposito d' un libro su Francesco Guardi), pp. 21-35.

landscape with the staple subject of 'ruins' figuring in them. His ruins, though a certain monotony is engendered by their recurrence, are always most picturesque, and never have the somewhat morbid sublimity of Piranesi's engravings of Rome. In his old age the painter is reported to have sold his *capricci*, as his landscapes with ruins are called, in Piazza S. Marco; and at the Castello, Milan, there is a large picture by an Italian artist, now deceased, representing this spectacle. It is a welcome, because sincere, token of admiration for the Venetian master, though it is not a great achievement as a painting. Whilst stress has been laid upon the effect of Guardi's environment on his art, it should be remembered that this influence was not far-reaching. His work never suffered, as Tiepolo's did, from the decadence which surrounded him. His chief artistic legacy to the world, which has established his present fame, and through which he has, like a true lover, articulated his praise of his fair mistress, the Queen of the Adriatic, consists of his pictures of Venice and its life. It is because we possess in Guardi a more interesting commentary of Venetian society and Venetian manners than in any of his distinguished fellow-painters, that it is important to bear in mind his surroundings.

Whence Guardi drew the secret of his wonderful art we are not told. His father, Domenico, who was a painter, died at Venice, his adopted home, a few years only after Francesco was born; history does not relate what became of his mother after her husband's death. As is well known, Guardi entered the school of Canale, who, soon after his return from Rome, made a name for himself as a painter of Venetian views. It might have been expected that Guardi would have come under the influence of Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, who married Cecilia, his sister, but his talented brother-in-law was a figure-painter. The absence of all information as to the relations which existed between Tiepolo and Guardi not unnaturally opens up a wide field for conjecture. It has recently been suggested by a critic of fertile imagination that Tiepolo sometimes inserted figures in Guardi's pictures; of such collaboration between the two there is no trace. When Guardi had developed into an artist Francesco Casanova, the brother of the notorious adventurer, was apprenticed to him; and the writer of the 'Memoirs' (Giacomo Casanova) relates a piquant episode concerning Guardi's excessive severity towards his pupil, the result of which was that the latter left his teacher and went to the studio of Francesco Simonini, where he learnt to paint battle scenes.

Putting aside the map of Guardi's life we may ask wherein his special aptitude for depicting Venice consists.

By temperament Guardi was peculiarly fitted to paint the city of the lagoons. M. Robert de la Sizeranne² considers that what impressed Ruskin most in the architecture of Venice was its asymmetry,

² Robert de la Sizeranne, 'Ruskin at Venice,' p. 33. (A lecture given during the Ruskin Commemoration at Venice, 21st of September, 1905.)

that is, its disdain of all classic rules, its irregularity of line and of composition. Without entering into the merits of this question we wish to borrow the word he uses, and venture to affirm that the asymmetry of Venetian architecture is its feature which most strongly appealed to Guardi. A good instance of it is afforded, if one examines the façade of the Ducal Palace at Venice, on the sea-front, with its two rows of windows which are irregularly constructed, not with any preconceived æsthetic idea, but in order to suit practical needs which were not originally foreseen by its architect. The court inside the Ducal Palace, which Guardi has again and again represented, has the same unsymmetrical form. No artist has perhaps rendered the picturesque aspect of Venice, resulting from what we may call the accidental character of its architecture, with such a light deft touch as Guardi, whether he depicted the church of S. Maria della Salute, which the Venetian of the eighteenth century loved to have painted for him owing to its somewhat rococo style, or the Piazza S. Marco, with the old and new Procurazie, which providentially do not, as most persons think, run in parallel lines. We grant that Guardi had one or two temperamental failings. He could not deal with linear perspective as well as Canale, whose sureness of hand he lacked, nor was he such a solid constructor. Such feats of architectural painting as the view of the Salute at the Louvre (Paris) by Canale, Guardi could not have produced, and yet he is now regarded as a more brilliant master than his teacher. He appeals to the present age by his faults no less than by his virtues, and if it is true that for a pupil to rival his leader he must have twice his talent, as someone has said, Guardi's superiority over Canale cannot now be gainsaid. The Philistines in the art world, who have failed to appreciate the beauty of his paintings along with their imperfections, which they are quick to detect, with a gravity worthy of Bacon, reproach him with lack of reverence for the noble architecture of Venice and do not forgive his fanciful treatment of edifices such as the Campanile. The Campanile of Guardi may indeed be said to have nibbled the mushroom of 'Alice in Wonderland,' whose property was to make Lodies alternately long and short. In order to paint those attractive views of Venice which, as Ticozzi³ informs us, the Venetians and the *stranieri* vied with one another eagerly to secure, he must have shifted his easel from one corner of the Piazza to the other so often that he knew every stone of it by heart, and might have painted it—as Turner is said to have painted many a sunrise and sunset—with his back turned to the scene he was rendering. There can be no doubt that Guardi painted at times from memory, and to this circumstance we may perhaps trace back the licenses which he took in dealing with architecture.

Guardi's peculiar aptitude for portraying not only the picturesque

³ Stefano Ticozzi, *Dizionario degli architetti*, &c., 1830 Milano: in due volumi. See vol. i. 'Guardi, Francesco.'

architecture of Venice, but also the picturesque side of its life, can be best illustrated by drawing a parallel between him and Whistler. In his pen and pencil drawings Guardi has produced effects of line which are very similar to those which we find in the etchings of his unconscious modern imitator. Be the Venetian scene a building, a lagoon, or both, they have dealt with the subject in an analogous way, observing salient features of this or that view with the same vivid sense of what is decorative and expressing their impressions in a style which is vigorous and incisive. A happy gift of composition completed their artistic equipment. In one respect, it may be observed, Guardi quite eclipses Whistler, and that is in his drawings of figures. Discussing the Chinese look about certain of Guardi's Venetian figures, a very clever critic, who may have had in mind the influence of Japanese art on Whistler, remarks that Guardi may have been influenced by Chinese design. Tiepolo's 'Chinoiseries' would supply him with a parallel, but there is no ground for supposing that Guardi's spirited figures are not entirely the creations of his own imagination. As Whistler's name has been mentioned, it may not be inopportune to point out that in Guardi, the master of *chiaroscuro* effects, we may also see the forerunner of the painter of daintily suggestive nocturnes. Whistler, like the Venetian, united a fine sense for the arrangement of light and shade with a good eye for harmonising different schemes of colour. Guardi's views of distant sunlit courts seen through archways and porticoes in shadow rank amongst his most originally conceived and highly prized efforts. The charm of these compositions is due to his adroitly massing shadows no less than to his felicitous choice of a subject.

Mr. B. Berenson¹ says that Canale painted Venice with a feeling for space and atmosphere combined with a mastery over the delicate effects of mist peculiar to it. Guardi excelled Canale in subtle treatment of effects of atmosphere and light, as can be seen from his four *chef's d'œuvre* in the Wallace Collection, where he is better represented by his 'S. Giorgio,' the 'Salute,' the 'Dogana' and the 'Rialto,' than in any other English museum. The chief attraction of these pictures, which are nearly monochromes in grey tones, consists in the bloom of their paint and the brilliant effect of silvery glitter on the surface of the smooth lagoons, which have an enamel-like appearance. John Addington Symonds,² who was a great admirer of Guardi, refers in his essay on Pietro Longhi to 'the gemmy brightness and glow of sunny gold' of Guardi's colouring. In his studies of sunset this brighter side of his palette was drawn upon and he has produced most beautiful iridescent effects of the departing sun flushing into pink the fringe of distant clouds. 'The gorgeous pageant of Venice,

¹ B. Berenson, *The Venetian Painters of the Renaissance*. New York, 1901, p. 74.

² John Addington Symonds, 'Essay on Pietro Longhi,' Vol. ii. pp. 338-340. -- *Memoirs of Count Carlo Gozzu*. London, 1890.

even in its decline, afforded Guardi ample scope for striking a gay note of colour in his pictures of its fêtes and most notably in his dazzling representations of the festival of the Wedding of the Adriatic.

Guardi has been said to be a connecting-link between Canale and Longhi, as, besides portraying Venice, he has depicted a variety of vivid scenes of its life. In his paintings of fêtes, of crowds, and of gatherings of fashionable society he proves himself to be a much more refined and piquant humorist than Longhi, who has been called the Venetian Hogarth. Guardi invests his compositions of public assemblies and interiors with a romantic suggestiveness which delights all beholders. John Addington Symonds vindicates his special claims, as compared with Canale, as a painter of 'the Venice of perukes, bagwigs, of masks and hoops and carnival disguises.' Guardi had, indeed, an eye for local and fashionable humours, whether his theme is one of the State receptions or banquets held in the Ducal Palace, a fair in Piazza S. Marco, an ascent of a balloon, a bustling crowd on tip-toe of excitement or a thrilling scene at a regatta on the Grand Canal. Each of these subjects he has handled with the same gusto. As pictorial chronicles of decadent Venice, Guardi's representations of Venetian manners have a unique value. Not long ago, for instance, there came to light, at the dispersal of an English private collection in London, one of his small interiors, which is still only known to a few connoisseurs, showing a masquerade at the Ridotto in Venice towards 1760, with numerous sprightly Watteau-like figures of ladies and gentlemen in rococo costumes.

The interest attached to this exquisite picture is enhanced by the fact that Longhi has also, though less brilliantly, depicted the same subject on a much larger scale, practically borrowing the whole of his composition from Guardi. It is so unusual to find examples of contemporary painters of different calibre leaving traces of their connection in their works, that the illustration furnished by the pictures of the Ridotto by Guardi and Longhi deserves to be ear-marked as a curiosity in the history of art. Owing to its many associations for the Venetians, it is earnestly to be hoped that Guardi's masterpiece will some day stray back to his native city and find a place by the side of Longhi's picture, which is at the Museo Correr, Venice. The Ridotto in that city, which was situated in the parish of S. Moisè in the eighteenth century, was the rendezvous of fashionable society and the hot-bed of gambling. In English books of travel, covering this period of time, it is frequently mentioned along with the festival of the Wedding of the Adriatic in connection with the attractions of Venice.

The fête of the *Bucentaur*, as the ceremony of the betrothal of the sea is also called, because on that solemn occasion the Doge proceeded to the Lido in his richly decorated State barge (the *Bucentaur*) to perform the symbolical rites observed each year on Ascension

Day, was a favourite theme of Canale and his followers. In his spirited renderings of Venice *en fête*, Guardi has completely check-mated his master. We are told that one of Guardi's pictures representing the Wedding of the Adriatic was once in the Ducal Palace at Venice; it is in private collections that most of these precious examples of his art are now treasured, in one of which Guardi, in a moment of unrestrained sensationalism, has introduced the fleet of galleys accompanying the *Bucentaur* in the act of firing off their cannons, which are enveloped in globes of white smoke, as a signal for the Doge to perform the time-honoured function of dropping a ring into the sea.

One of the most instructive pages of Guardi's life relates to a commission, which he received in his old age, to paint four pictures representing fêtes in honour of the visit of Pius the Sixth to Venice. It is not a little flattering to our national vanity that on this occasion, as on a previous one, recorded by Senator Gradenigo, our countrymen should have come forward as patrons of Guardi, and acquired his works straight from his easel. The name of the *forestiere inglese* referred to by Gradenigo in his Diary is not vouchsafed, but we are told that the Venetian views executed for him were exhibited by Guardi in Piazza S. Marco, where they met with universal applause. Pietro Edwards, for whom Guardi painted the pictures relating to Pius the Sixth's visit, was also an Englishman. By profession he was a dealer and picture-restorer, and resided in Venice, where he became well known through his public services. He was so satisfied with Guardi's pictures that he made him a present of eight sequins over and above the sum stipulated between them. This handsome reward of the labour of the painter contrasts with Consul Smith's somewhat mercenary treatment of Canale, if we may trust Horace Walpole's version, according to which Canale's patron engaged him to work for him for a long term of years at low rates.⁶ The picture of the Papal Benediction at the Oxford University Galleries is one of the set of four pendants painted by Guardi for Pietro Edwards, though it is uncertain whether it is the original representation, or one of the artist's replicas after his own work. It is of interest to note that Pietro Edwards, like Guardi, was a member of the confraternity of painters at Venice (*Fraglia dei pittori*), a survival of one of the old guilds (*scuole*), said to have been introduced in the eighth century into Italy from Germany by S. Boniface. Though we do not know that Consul Smith employed Guardi, it is difficult to suppose that he did not extend his patronage to him. The well-known dilettante Algarotti, according to Rosini,⁷ on one occasion secured Guardi's services for painting a companion picture to a work by Canale, representing the Rialto, with the Basilica of Vicenza designed by Palladio,

⁶ Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting*, p. 450.

⁷ Giovanni Rosini, *Storia della Pittura Italiana*, 1849-1854, tome vii. p. 14.

instead of with the actual buildings on it. The fashion of mingling the romantic with the real had Algarotti's⁸ approval. This new departure in painting (*nuovo genere di pittura*, as he calls it) he defends on the ground that it enables the artist to improve upon nature. To the decadents it afforded a welcome opportunity of introducing in their landscapes whatever was most *barocco* in architecture. The principle of the combination of fanciful with real scenery, though it is not sanctioned by modern canons of art, was applied to perfection by Guardi in his imaginary compositions. In spite of the fact that the composed landscape (*paysage ajusté*) has long ago been superseded in practice by the landscape faithfully copied after nature, Guardi's *capricci*, especially his small ones, owing to their originality, depth of feeling and charm of colouring, continue to captivate all art lovers. Of Guardi's more ambitious landscapes there are only a few in existence. Until a short time ago, one could see in a castle at Udine three masterpieces executed by him for an ancestor of its present owner, from whom he is reported to have received four hundred *ducats*. They had remained, ever since they had been painted, in possession of the same noble family, pent up in a lady's boudoir. Students of Tiepolo will remember that the Friulian capital was the scene of this painter's artistic activity on more than one occasion. In view of this circumstance, it seems not unnatural to suppose that it was through him that Guardi obtained the important commission executed by him at Udine. From other sources we know that Guardi made occasional trips on the mainland north of his native city, and that in his old age he visited his paternal home in the Tyrol. At Mastellina, the house of his ancestors, which still exists, is known as 'Casa Guardi,' and a commemorative tablet in honour of Francesco Guardi is shortly to be placed on its façade. The day, it may be hoped, is not far off when a similar tribute may be paid to the long-neglected memory of the painter in his native city. Guardi died at Venice in 1793, in a humble house situated in the parish of S. Canziano. He left several sons, one of whom (Giacomo) painted small views of Venice and the islands around it without having any of his father's talent. A daughter of Guardi eloped with an Irishman, according to the testimony of a living descendant of the pair.

Taking a bird's-eye view of the history of Venetian landscape painting, in order to assign to Canale and to Guardi their place and to view them in the proper light, we may distinguish between an early and a late period of it. In the works of the earlier Venetian masters, scenery is often a very striking feature, but it was treated by them, as a rule, as an accessory to the composition rather than as landscape introduced for its own sake, whether they manifested their appreciation of the beauty of their surroundings by painting

⁸ Francesco Algarotti's Letters. See Gio. Bottari's *Raccolta di lettere sulla pittura*, &c., vol. vii. p. 427 (1823).

natural scenery, following the example of Giovanni Bellini, Giorgione and Titian, or by making use of architectural settings for their pictures in the manner of Gentile Bellini and Vittore Carpaccio. With the advent of Titian, whom Algarotti⁹ rightly calls the 'Homer of landscape painters' (*è tra paesisti l' Omero*) a new era may be said to have dawned in the treatment of natural scenery. He exerted a far-reaching influence upon the development of the later Venetian landscape painters. A faint reminiscence of his colouring may perhaps be found in the light blue atmosphere which bathes the distant hills in the backgrounds of many of Guardi's landscapes.

Canale and Guardi may be said to have been the first Venetian masters who gave their undivided attention to the study of landscape. Canale was the originator of the 'View of Venice.' As a painter of perspectives, he had imitators not only in Venice, where he founded a school, but also in England and in France. He visited this country, where his pictures were much appreciated (his finest one being the view of Whitehall at Montagu House, which he alone could have painted), and his work was not without some influence on English landscape painting, which was at that time in its infancy. In France he had followers in the elder and younger Ragenets. Both Frenchmen produced views of the Seine, around Paris, even as English painters depicted scenes of the river Thames, the attractions of which Canale seems to have been the first to turn to account in his views. Canale, the 'Raphael of marine painting,' as he is styled by Algarotti, acquired a European reputation during his lifetime, and the lustre of his name was not dimmed after his death.

Guardi's history forms a strong contrast to that of his master, and it is instructive to follow his rise from the time when he was almost forgotten to the present day, when he may be said to have reached the secure heights of fame. The Abbé Vianelli, a contemporary of Guardi and owner of more than one of his landscapes, in the printed Catalogue of his pictures, only relates that in his old age the painter continued to be active in Venice. During the early part of the last century Canale's name seems to have clung to that of Guardi like a deadweight, and in their biographical notices the Venetians rarely mention him without the remark that he was Canale's imitator and pupil. Speaking of Guardi and Canale in his work *Histoire de l'Art du paysage*,¹⁰ Deperthes makes the mistake of supposing that Canaletto was the surname of both painters. It is curious that Brustoloni, who lived at the same time as Guardi, should have also confused the master and pupil and by mistake inscribed the name of Canale on the margin of his engravings after a well-known series of paintings of Venetian public ceremonies by Guardi. The

⁹ *Saggio del Conte Algarotti sull' architettura e sulla pittura* (Reprint), Milano, 1831, p. 87.

¹⁰ T. B. Deperthes, *Histoire de l'Art du paysage*, Paris, 1822, p. 519.

disentanglement of the works of the one from those of the other appears to have presented considerable difficulty at the outset and it was only when connoisseurship improved that the individual manner of each painter was recognised. Guardi's more accentuated style is well known to experts, who are unable to pronounce with certainty upon Canale's works. Canale's broader manner of painting, of which some fine examples exist at Windsor Castle, may perhaps be accounted for by supposing that there was an interchange of influence between master and pupil. The two painters seem occasionally to have collaborated on the same canvas, as Missaglia affirms they did. Recently some attention has been devoted to another of Canale's distinguished pupils, Bernardo Bellotto, whose Venetian views are still sometimes attributed to his master and even to Guardi. In order to establish a complete list of Canale's *œuvre*, it would be necessary, in the first place, to separate Bellotto's works from his own, which is by no means as easy a task as that of distinguishing between those of Guardi and Canale.

Like Hobbema, Guardi began by being a connoisseurs' painter. At first, his aims were only understood by a few art lovers, the circle of which gradually widened. Rosini,¹¹ who alludes to Guardi's too free employment at times of '*oltremare*' (the sapphire-like tint, alternating with turquoise blue, which we find in many of his skies is an effect which we may attribute to the use of this pigment as a glazing), makes the naïve remark, 'Francesco Guardi è quello che più piace di ogn' altro ai non intendenti per l' effetto che desta col brio del pennello.' (Francesco Guardi is the master who appeals more than any other to those who have no discernment, by reason of the effects which he produces with the sparkle of his brush.) It took a century or more for enlightened artistic opinion to awaken to Guardi's true worth. Not long ago Canale was still considered as 'on the whole the higher master.' Whereas in the old Venice Academy of Painting, founded towards the end of the eighteenth century, Canale was represented by one painting, no single work of Guardi was to be found in the Accademia di Belle Arti until quite recently. In English private collections his pictures have always abounded; some (Lord Castletown's two *chefs d'œuvre* for instance—one a view of Piazza S. Marco, and the other a view of the Piazzetta) were acquired in the painter's lifetime, when it was customary for Englishmen of birth and breeding to make the 'Grand Tour' and bring home from Rome or Venice for the gallery of the paternal mansion in England some picture or 'marble' as a souvenir of their visit to Italy. Throughout the nineteenth century, commencing with the first Lord Dover, who brought together a great number of Guardi's works, his paintings have been keenly sought after, and the result has been that the Venetian palaces have been gradually stript of the examples of his

¹¹ Giovanni Rosini, *Storia della Pittura Italiana*, 1849-54, tome vii. p. 14.

art which they originally housed, so that hardly any are now left in Guardi's native city. The fact may be recalled that among the works of Old Masters with which Constable¹² surrounded himself, when his means allowed him to humour his taste for them, there were two works by Guardi, one of them a view of Piazza S. Marco, which, at the dispersal of his collection in 1838, realised a higher sum than any of his other pictures, which included works by Ruysdael, Everdingen, Van Goyen, Wynants, and Wilson. Constable had access to not a few English private collections, and it is through them that he became acquainted with the pictures of Guardi and of the Dutch masters. Constable's second picture by the Venetian painter, which is described as a 'view of a fountain with figures,' may have been one of his *capricci*.

Guardi only entered into his kingdom, so to speak, a generation or two afterwards. He was not only one of the precursors of the romantic and impressionistic school, but the founder of the modern sketch on panel and one of the earliest workers in water-colours. He seems to exert a more direct influence upon modern painters than Canale, with whose aims they are less in sympathy. Among those who were active at Venice during the last century, we may mention Bonington, Turner and Ziem. Turner eclipsed all painters of Venice, who came before and after him, by the series of splendid views of it produced in 1839. Ziem, who is perhaps the most esteemed living master who portrays Venice, forms a most striking contrast to Guardi by reason of his gorgeous combinations of blue waters and gay shipping. Modern artists would do well, if, instead of imitating them, they would follow the example of Guardi, whose paintings, while sober in tone, are nearly always brilliant in general effect.

GEORGE A. SIMONSON.

¹² M. Sturge Henderson's *Life of John Constable* (Duckworth, 1905), p. 210, Appendix.

THE STUDY OF FURNITURE

I

'THE proper study of mankind is man,' but we cannot study man aright save in his surroundings, where those things are most significant that he has chosen for himself. Hence much has been written on the philosophy of clothes, and much also on the philosophy of architecture. The garden has afforded the moralist fruit for meditation and sentiment has blossomed in the language of flowers. Even the beehive has not deterred the curious, though repentance come with a sting. None the less, human edification owes somewhat to architecture in wax, wisdom has been sucked from honey cells, and Shakespeare found the perfect polity in the ordered regiment of honey bees.

How comes it, then, that furniture remains the province of the connoisseur and the broker? Wardour Street, so far, has provided the wise with nothing better than a metaphor for the sham anachronism. Yet, in Wardour Street you may find cabinets containing the dust of dead secrets, wardrobes of buhl fit for Carlyle's 'Dandiacal' dressing room, caskets open to receive your jewels, and lamps more numerous than the mystic 'seven.' (These last are offered at prices that illuminate the commercial instinct of Aladdin's enemy when he bartered new lamps for old.) But you need not go as far as Wardour Street in search of inspiration. Seek the nearest pawnbroker and learn how his golden spheres are but pledges of the fruit that symbolists may pluck within. Here is the parable-maker's paradise—intended for him, untended by him, it needs to be watered with fountains of tears. Seek one of the little 'boxes,' and imagine the theatre of many a tragedy. The actors pass, but the poor 'properties' remain, so that poet and pessimist may make their own what is beyond 'redemption.' Here, too, the moralist may find a place fit for common-places; but the moralist perhaps might be more usefully employed if he frequented the 'show rooms' of Oxford Street. There he would find less romance and more credit, many a problem for the plain dealer, enough upholstery to pad out a volume of description, and enough of cheap imitation to furnish a 'Study' for the author of the *Book of Snobs*.

. If, however, you are more interested in man than in metaphors, if you are more interested in life than in living by criticism, if you are capable of co-ordinating facts for the purpose of a wide induction, you may neglect the shops, philosophise at home, or speculate in the houses of others. From the furniture and its arrangement you will learn to divine the history of a family for a generation or more, with its many members, past fortunes, discarded hobbies, conflicting interests and cupboard skeletons. There is in every house, not newly furnished, abundant material for meditation ; but as you stir up the dust of the past and comprehend the rubbish in a sweeping generalisation, see that you take all things into account, lest you stumble over a neglected footstool. And when you leave your house and stir abroad, you may still pursue your hobby. The lover of conventional romance will find his inspiration in Hardwick Hall or Cothelie Manor House, while the plain man may learn to estimate his new neighbours by the bric-à-brac in their drawing-room. The critic strolling through Hertford House will find fresh data for deciding which was the authentic protrait—Lord Steyne or Lord Monmouth ; which the truer artist—Thackeray or Beaconsfield. The cynic will amuse himself in the mansion of the millionaire by noting his attempts to live up to his furniture ; while the narrow wisdom of Diogenes will be explained by a reference to his contracted environment within a tub.

The study of furniture provides fresh possibilities to philosophers, historians, poets, artists, and preachers. Philosophers may discuss how far the categorical imperative has become inoperative by the evolution of armchairs ; or what are the 'relations' conditioned by a Chesterfield. The historian may aptly illustrate most of the differences between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries by a heavy oak coffer, richly carved, and a dainty escritoire, delicately inlaid. We would not counsel the ladies who write verses to emulate Sappho and hymn Aphrodite ; but they would find innocent employment if they studied Eliza Cook, penned odes to 'an old armchair,' and elaborated the sentiments proper to the 'household room.' Some impressionist painters might mount the stool of repentance if only they tried to paint stools with the fidelity of Van Ostade, and pianists might learn what they owe to mechanism if they would try to practise on their great-grandmother's spinet. The preacher might turn with advantage from the much controverted question of Church clothes, and find a text in the modern boudoir, worthy the declamation of a Chrysostom. He will not need a golden tongue to do justice to gold and white brocades ; and he need not fear the persecution of any Eudoxia, for the modern great lady likes plain speaking, and has realised that denunciation is after all an advertisement.

Furniture then, necessary to everyone, offers to everyone fruit

for meditation. The wise man not only adapts himself to his environment, but endeavours to understand it. When he sits to think in his study chair, he should know what it is that supports him.

II

The philosophy of furniture need fear no comparison with the philosophy of architecture. Nay! It is the more proper study for man. The wild beast has his den, the bird his nest, man his house. But man has furniture, while beast and bird have none. We should therefore study furniture to discern what is distinctive in man.

Or if we concern ourselves with history, furniture again has the advantage. Architecture lends itself to cold and hard generalisations—we think of the plummet and the line. We talk of history written in stone, but it is history petrified and without life. A monument reminds us of a dead man, but it does not recall him. His empty chair is more significant; and when it is worthily filled he is well represented. We study history that we may extend our life's outlook indefinitely—though it be backwards; that we may serve ourselves heirs to the ages that are gone; that we may enrich and vary the poor monotony of life by entering into the past and making it present to our minds. We long to recall persons and episodes we wish to see, to know in the concrete: we leave to the writer of text-books the task of summarising an age. Now a palace is built for a dynasty, but furniture is arranged for the convenience of a day. Furniture, therefore, accords better with the historic imagination. Bacon planned us a house fit for princes, but he did not furnish it. We can compare his theories with Thorpe's practice, and learn the more from Thorpe; but we would give the whole of the 'New Atlantis' for a peep into my Lord's laboratory at Gorhambury, and life would be refreshed if Bacon had reflected on the cakes and ale to be found in the still-room of Dame Alice. You tell me, however, of your old house, of corridors echoing with secrets, and chambers tenanted by ghosts. But is it the house or the furniture that holds the treasure of the past? Furnish it anew from Maples' and see if the old-world spirit does not evaporate at once. Ghosts, poor shivering nonentities, love not the modern spirit, and have no 'parts' to be gratified with modern luxury. They know but one meaning to the word 'brokerage'; and like 'brokers' that have failed, they vanish on 'change.'

Turn, then, from contemplating your Tudor mansion and look upon this little Dutch interior hung in the hall. Here is a 'living room' and not the mere abstraction called 'a dwelling.' It is but of small consequence that a white-capped grandmother nods in that grand old chair, or that the plumed cavalier drinks from the flagon

at the old oak board. Do not note that the child hangs perilously forth from the deep-bayed window, or judge the points of that indifferent dog couchant upon the mat. The figures are not so eloquent as the furniture. These chairs and tables were arranged for an ordered ceremonious family life with which we are unfamiliar. These ornaments, painted with such precision, are not the produce of bazaars, but the heirlooms and the evidence of transmitted taste. That curtain bellying with the wind fixes the moment. Here is the breath of life, and we can add to our years a past into which we can enter with satisfaction. To realise detail in true perspective and proportion is to know the secret of appropriate living.

Returning to the old building, what is it that fascinates us? We do not wish to see it again as it was when the masons left it. We welcome the lichen and the ivy, we love the crumbling mullion, we regret not the broken string-course—why? because they recall the past? No, but because they tell us of the flow of time and humanise for us the mocking permanence of stone. Architecture, in fact, is less interesting because buildings are, or were, built to last. There is a stubborn fixity about them while all things change. They intrude so obviously on the present, and belong so incongruously to the past. Over the gulf between past and present is the bridge of ruin and decay. The sentimental may revel in it beneath the moon; but those who believe in life's purpose, and have a pulse for actuality, would learn from the past a healthier and more inspiring lesson. Past and present are fused together in a furnished room, and harmonise in a mind conscious of its being and retentive of what has been. History is writ more graciously in wood than stone. Wood takes more forms, is more adaptable, condescends to all classes, is less austere, more comfortable and takes an easier polish.

Furniture can be altered, added to, and variously disposed. Furniture gains in polish and colouring as it advances in age. It endures but it does not decay. When it is broken it is apotheosised in fire. Furniture also can be moved, and in these days of mobility and mutability man cannot carry his house, like a snail, upon his back. But if like Stevenson he is compelled to seek some far-away Vailima, he can carry with him the old chairs, he can gaze at the old pictures, and drink out of the same 'crystal' as he did at home.

On the other hand we can only study architecture by years of travel. We can never live in the contemplation of much that we admire. But the student of furniture can collect about him movables of every date and every clime, and make his home an exposition of his tastes. Quizzical Horace Walpole could pick up the gauntlet of Francis the chivalrous on his staircase and exchange a nod with the bust of Vespasian in his gallery; he could entertain the Gummings with china gods, and with goddesses in porcelain; and then retire to his cabinet, 'formed upon the idea of a Catholic chapel' (save the

mark !), and write *The Castle of Otranto*. You jeer at the old collector. He, at any rate you say, was not philosophic ; he knew nothing of inculcating a creed by symbols or teaching morality by metaphors. Horace Walpole, my superior friend, could afford to laugh at himself and at the trinkets he honestly paid for ; when you are sufficiently philosophic to pay for what you laugh at, you may collect postage stamps or accumulate ' tickets of leave.'

III .

Furniture, then, need not fear to rival architecture in interest, and I believe that students of furniture can afford to despise the philosophy of clothes. I do not mean that anyone may despise the philosophy of clothes. Carlyle has opened the seams of sartorial patchwork and drawn out the thread of transcendental mystery with exclamations and ululations and not a little crowing. Had he only turned his attention to furniture the fashion of his philosophic cloak would not have embarrassed him, while the puckers and creases of his humour might not have irritated his readers. Anyhow he would have realised that a man's activity depends more on the comfort of his chair than on the cut of his breeches.

Still, clothes are important, they touch us so closely, fetter the freedom of our movements, enhance our comeliness and cover our uncomely parts. We are hardly ever free of them, modesty requires them, cold necessitates them, rank is expressed by them, character indicated ; they fit or misfit us like the circumstances of our life. But is not furniture quite as significant ? Sherlock Holmes may detect a policeman by his boots, but many a man has been betrayed by a padded armchair. Seneca tells us in his works what he wished to be ; his sumptuous ' insula,' that excited the envy of Nero, tells us more of what he was. How many tables of cedar, how many ivory cabinets, how many Myrrhene vases were needed to accommodate a philosopher who preached that man should be self-contained ? The key to your study, my friend, opens the door to your secrets.

But not only is character revealed by furniture, but furniture is a necessity of ordered life. Carlyle asked us to imagine a naked House of Lords, and convinced us at once that coverings were as necessary to a legislature as circumlocutions ; Huxley called on us to conceive of primitive men voting one of their number into a tree for lack of a chair, and we abandoned Locke and laughed at Rousseau, because we knew that there could be no session of Parliament without seats.

Carlyle wrote upon church clothes in an esoteric spirit. He took us into no actual vestry, for he had never studied in Durandus the symbolic meanings of vestments. Bishop Blougram, on the other hand, has provided us with a creed, or the apology for a creed,

in the fittings for a cabin outward bound ; and Gigadibs, the literary man, if he bought no cabin furniture, at least, in consequence, put his hand to the plough and 'studied his last chapter of St. John.' Not everyone has preached to so good effect as Sylvester Blougram, *in partibus episcopis* !

But leaving Carlyle wrapt up in his garments, let us take a broader view. What clothes are to the individual, furniture is to the family ; and the family is the true unit, for man is a social creature. The artificial upper classes may make much of the importance of the 'trousseau,' but the unsophisticated poor still talk of getting a home together, and mean by that the purchase of furniture. The rich find that the charm of the 'trousseau' ends with the honeymoon ; but adding to the furniture of a home affords romance to the poor all their lives.

'On the day that I was born,' writes Mr. Barrie, 'we bought six hair-bottomed chairs, and in our little house it was an event, the first great victory in a woman's long campaign.' He goes on with truth and modesty : 'Neighbours came to see the boy and the chairs.' The poor measure their lives by the number of their invariables, and celebrate a victory in each additional ornament. So real is this pleasure that Cousin Bridget lamented to Elia that they were no longer poor, and, in consequence, no longer desired new luxuries because they could no longer triumph in their purchase.

But all classes, save the newly rich, have their household gods ; and perhaps we may account for the vulgarity of the parvenu by remembering his lack of that old furniture which guards the sanctity of home. Chairs and tables, ornaments of trifling merit, tell us not only of ourselves but of our loved ones. Blatant egotism is reprovèd when we sit in our father's chair, and scribble our memoranda at our great-grandmother's *escritoire*. As links with the past, as linking us with others, we love these evidences of our corporate existence ; we love them for themselves, and they have the merit to be as useful as if we loved them not.

We change our clothes so often ; we wear them out so soon ; we cannot bear to look at our old photographs because they picture us in such ridiculous garments. We turn from them with a fear of being old-fashioned, or worse—unfashionable. With furniture the older it is the better. The clothes of princes go at last to deck a scarecrow, but the cottage dresser decorates a hall in villadom and grows in dignity with age. Our neighbours do not despise us because we inherited our chairs, but what would they say if for a moment they suspected that we wore second-hand clothes ? The poor may covet the furbelows and frills of the rich, they may envy the gloss of the black coat and the gleam of the white linen ; but even they would prefer new clothes if they could get them, and they are not very grateful for cast-off apparel.

I have seen Laud's cope and Wellington's Waterloo uniform. I have looked over them with veneration, but I have not wished for similar garments. How, on the other hand, I have longed for certain rooms, to see them, to inhabit them, to feel the influence of their refinement. I should like to have shared with St. Jerome, and not with his lion, that sunny scriptorium where Dürer drew him writing. I should like to say my prayers at the little faldstool in that quiet neat chamber of St. Ursula, that Carpaccio painted. I feel that I, too, might have thrilled with the song of the birds had I awakened in Chaucer's bed; and I should have been tempted to no treachery had I stolen from the trunk of Iachimo at midnight to survey Imogen's queenly apartment. This, you say, is mere sentiment. So it is, but are we not all sensitive to our surroundings and the better for their being beautiful? In the Bodleian Library I have felt stir within me the spirit of research, a longing for a scholarship that was not mine. I have drummed on a table beneath Panizzi's dome, impatient for my books, intending rapid reference, and eager to escape—to find more interest in a mummy case and the grotesque furniture of the dead.

All furniture is instructive even when it is not beautiful. Do not despise those chairs and tables of the early Victorian era! Well-made and ill-designed, they tell us of an age when good works and mean thoughts formed terms of alliance in the philosophy of the Utilitarians. Would Teufelsdröckh interpose? Would he maintain that crinolines and chignons are eloquent of a time when women despised God's handiwork, and destroyed their beauty by their own inventions? No, Mein Herr, your teaching is at fault. You have not read Mr. Balfour's argument on Naturalism and Æsthetic. Is not he *the* authority on the significance of bonnets?

The historian after all is but the 'journeyman joiner' of the past. His craft consists of ingenious dovetailing. His success in part depends on the skill with which he upholsters his scenes. He finds curtains necessary to disguise his ignorance. There was a time when he went astray and strove to reconstruct history by means of roots, but philology proved a sorry guide. He has now, with better results, sought inspirations from pots; and the incidents painted on broken vases yield many an instructive lesson.

The first clothes that took the form of aprons may antedate all furniture; but furniture remains extant after all clothes have become cobwebs.

There have been historic garments. Gowns have been devised by will; romance has toyed with a glove and flaunted with a scarf; scandal has found occasion in a wardrobe. We could tell anecdotes about Elizabeth's petticoats, the boots of William Rufus, or the sky-blue coat of Robespierre. The cope of St. Martin was for long the palladium of France, and more than one nation has suffered

an interdict because of a dispute as to a pallium. But even in this field furniture is superior. What a volume might be written on bedsteads (I will not write it lest you sleep), and what can compare in interest with the three great chairs of Christendom—at Westminster, at Aachen, and at Rome? But those three chairs could only be treated properly in a separate essay. They overwhelm my imagination and afford no resting places for my fancies. To think of them aright I pause. • • • •

H. MAYNARD SMITH.

THE GHENT SCHOOL FOR MOTHERS

NOT far from the beautiful town hall of Ghent and the imposing cathedral of St. Bavon runs an obscure and narrow street, the Rue Basse, and there early one Sunday morning we were directed to No. 6, the babies' dispensary. Ghent, though not so beautiful as the neighbouring town of Bruges, is picturesquely situated on several islands at the confluence of two rivers, and it was formerly the capital of the County of Flanders. At the time of its greatest splendour it numbered a quarter of a million of inhabitants, an energetic, independent sort of people, always at war with their counts or their kings. The birthplace of Charles the Fifth, its turbulent independence was a source of great anxiety to him, and finally determined him in 1540 to construct a great citadel, from whence his garrison could dominate the town. After the erection of 'this tomb of their privileges and prosperity,' the town steadily decreased in numbers until something of the former prosperity was brought back by the introduction of the spinning-jenny, the building of a port and of the Terneuzen Canal, and, finally, the founding of a university under the Dutch dominion. But Ghent has not become again a residential town, its population of 162,000 consisting principally of workers in the textile mills. Wages are low and hours are long, and a very large number of married women are employed in the factories. This fact alone probably accounts largely for the rate of infant mortality, which had reached in 1901 the very high figure of 333 deaths per 1,000 births, as compared with 208 deaths per 1,000 births in Burnley, one of our worst English towns.

This terrible slaughter of infants came to the attention of the *Vooruit* or 'Forwards' Society of Socialists, working men and women endowed with the true fighting spirit of the earlier town burghers, whose enemy this time was not a count or a king, but Death. Among them a young doctor set himself to devise a complete system which should not only save the infants of the present, but should also prepare the young mothers of the future for their responsibilities. He started about five years ago the 'Society for Helping Mothers,' under the auspices of the *Bureau de Bienfaisance*, an old endowed and rate-aided charity, and his kind invitation enabled us to see something of his unique work.

(By 'us' I mean a party of members of the Women's Co-operative Guild who had gone to Belgium to study the work of foreign co-operative and socialist societies.) We found Dr. Miele in his little consulting-room, opening out of a large waiting-room, where a number of mothers sat with their babies. Everything was scrupulously clean, and the white walls were decorated with attractively painted Flemish mottoes, such as :

Een moeder die heur
plight voldoet
Heur kind met hare
borsten voedt.

(That mother does her duty best, who feeds her children from the breast.)

Luistert naar dokters
wijzen raad
En niet naar ieders
zot gepraat.

(The doctor's wise advice obey, don't heed what foolish prattlers say.)

We were given seats on a bench with three nicely dressed girls of from eleven to fourteen, who were watching the proceedings with the greatest interest. The doctor explained that they were candidates for his course in child nurture, and that they were expected to watch the consultations for some time before joining in the practical work of the course.

Two of the students were there, neat young girls of fifteen or sixteen, hard at work weighing the babies, marking charts, and taking temperatures. As each mother came in she placed her baby in the weighing cradle and handed her chart to the doctor. After he had verified the weight, he took the child himself from the scales and held it so gently in his strong hands that not a single baby, even the sickliest, cried at his examination. After asking the mother a few questions in Flemish about the child's health and her own, he wrote the necessary order for the next week's milk or specially prepared food, and gave it to the mother with a printed card of directions for feeding, selected from about ten varieties of cards. The mother then deposited her payment, any sum from one to fifteen centimes (under $\frac{1}{4}$ d. to $1\frac{1}{2}$ d.), according to her means, and retired with her baby. With prompt precision, but with no sense of hurry, child after child was seen, about forty being presented in less than two hours that Sunday morning. On weekdays one dispensary is open at eight in the morning, the other from six to eight in the evening. The consultations are longest in the summer, and when there is an epidemic of diarrhoea they sometimes keep the doctor and his young assistants busy for four hours and more.

As we understood no Flemish, Dr. Miele kept up a running commentary on the cases in excellent English. Here was a woman with her sixteenth child, which had inherited a severe disease from

the father, here was a delicate seventeenth child, here a tenth, and again a tenth, all under weight. Here came a twelfth child, very small and consumptive, the mother, 'a good woman but short of feed' from her husband's low wages having already lost eight children. Of a family, where eight, again, had died, another eleventh baby was being treated, but it was not so small as the baby of a bobbin spinner. The worst cases, indeed, were the babies of those mothers employed in linen factories, who not only cannot themselves care for their children, but who also suffer in health from the necessarily humid atmosphere of a linen mill. The damp steam from water, often putrid, is particularly bad for their breasts. The Belgian law, like the English, allows women to work up to the time of childbirth, requiring a compulsory rest of four weeks afterwards.

But Dr. Miele welcomes healthy babies, as well as sickly ones, as long as they are brought to him regularly, and he showed us several fine-looking ones, with a chart line *above* the average. One such baby was brought in the arms of a splendid-looking old woman, 'the great mother,' Dr. Miele explained, 'who is very fearful and comes every day.' A neat-looking young mother presented a fine child of three months. 'She lost her first baby, and the husband was so upset that he sent her very often to consult me before the birth of this baby.' But we were told that some of the healthiest-looking children had no real stamina, but would fall away terribly after only one day's illness, and then recover very slowly.

Here was a mother to report on the illness of a baby, whom the doctor promised to visit later in the day. 'That child has a cough, and I never allow coughing children to come here, or, of course, children with any infectious diseases.' Here was an older sister, of twelve or thirteen, with the baby. 'I encourage the sisters to come,' said the doctor, 'as it teaches them early the care of children.' Here was a very dirty baby, the only dirty one we had seen. 'This is the mother's first visit, and I shall not say much about cleanliness,' said the doctor, 'for she will see the standard of the other mothers, and will not bring her baby dirty a second time. The mothers learn quickly, and are very obedient to all my orders, though 25 per cent. of them cannot read the cards.' (Education is not compulsory in Belgium.) It is a question whether the better educated English mothers would be so amenable to orders, but the mothers of Ghent certainly deserve great credit for their contribution to the striking success of Dr. Miele's work. Out of a thousand children presented yearly, 27 per cent. died the first year, but now the mortality is only 4 per cent., though many of the children are, of course, peculiarly delicate.

In a long talk, after the mothers and babies had gone, Dr. Miele explained to us the interaction of the twelve different 'services,' as he calls them, which makes his work so unique. First the

dispensaries, with 1,000 babies presented annually for treatment, four-fifths paying, one-fifth free. Secondly is the 'service' of the 'visiting mothers.' Unlike the health visitors of Huddersfield, Finsbury, &c., these mothers are themselves working women, and are chosen by the doctor from those dispensary mothers who show most evident proof of intelligence and devotion to the work. Having been well trained by him in the care of babies, and in the preparation of their food, they go at his request to visit the inexperienced mothers in their neighbourhood, and take under their protection the ill-cared-for babies. They receive no pay, but are proud of the honour of being chosen by Dr. Miele, who could not speak too highly of their helpful zeal, from both the practical and the moral point of view.

The third 'service' is the Mothers' Friendly Society, in which any mother can enter any baby under fifteen months by paying fifteen centimes (1½d.) a week, or, if very poor, seven centimes (less than 1d.) a week, even these small payments being suspended in the case of unemployment, or of long illness. For this sum, and if it is brought regularly to the dispensary, the baby is entitled to receive free every sort of medical aid, including vaccination, and the mother is helped if she is in great trouble or want. More than 400 children are entered in this Friendly Society, and the mortality is practically nothing.

The fourth 'service' is the Ghent Milk Depot, from which the *Bureau de Bienfaisance* distributes humanised or sterilised milk to indigent babies, on Dr. Miele's orders. More than 400 babies have been brought up on this pure milk.

The next 'service' is one of giving milk, again by the doctor's orders, to indigent mothers who are nursing their babies. One quart is given every day, and this not only improves the mother's health, and the quantity and quality of her milk, but also serves as a valuable moral support to young nursing mothers. We saw one mother who had been receiving this milk, and her baby was a fat little thing, well above normal weight.

A further 'service' is in the milk depots in different parts of the town, where sterilised milk is sold at thirty centimes a litre (about 3d. a quart) or at 2d. or even 1d. to the very poor mothers of the Friendly Society. Further, Dr. Miele prepares in his own home a number of special foods for babies' digestive troubles, selling them at from three to six centimes a meal (just over or under ½d.).

Another 'service' consists in health talks to mothers, given on Sundays during the winter, illustrated by lantern slides and by the exhibition of babies' hygienic clothing, &c.

The ninth 'service' is a course on child culture for girls of from fourteen to eighteen. Besides a simple theoretic course in anatomy and infant physiology, the girls have practical courses in the preparation of sterilised milk and of all food for infants, in the dispensary work of weighing, marking charts, and taking temperatures, and finally

in the *crèches*, where for a time each pupil takes sole charge of one baby. For the first two years these girls, though they come from working-class homes, are paid nothing, but at sixteen they begin to earn twenty-five francs (1*l.*) a month, rising to thirty francs, and this is considered good pay in Ghent. This 'service' is one of the most valuable, as it not only assures to the doctor a constant supply of willing young helpers, but also educates, for their future career of motherhood, a large number of the working girls of the town. Dr. Miele has a similar practical course of training for foster-mothers, who are entitled to receive one or two or even more babies, either every day or altogether, according to the wishes and means of the mothers employed in factories. This system has an obvious advantage over the old way of confiding the baby to a neighbour, who is not necessarily fitted for the work. These foster-mothers are trained and inspected, taking the babies every week to the dispensary, and they are very proud of the diplomas given after they have been successful with their charges. Each of Dr. Miele's four small *crèches* is presided over by one or more of these foster-mothers, and the really intelligent ones are being trained (the twelfth 'service') for special nursing of skin diseases, consumption, &c., and even for the care of incubator babies. (There are no properly trained nurses in Ghent, nor is there a hospital for children.)

Dr. Miele was kind enough to show us two of these model *crèches*, where he receives ill or delicate children. We were particularly interested in one little girl, a tiny seven months' baby, who had just spent two months in the doctor's beautiful and expensive incubator, and we were told that she would soon be a fine big baby. None of the infants ever have diarrhœa in his *crèches*, although 58 per cent. of the dispensary babies have it in some form every summer. The doctor only charges 4*s.* weekly for each *crèche* baby though it costs him 8*s.*, without reckoning his own time and efforts. Towards the expenses of all his twelve 'services' the *Bureau de Bienfaisance* only grants him 1,500 francs (60*l.*) yearly. Besides this he has very little pecuniary help, but he manages to keep down his expenses somewhat by interesting and utilising poor women as visiting mothers, foster-mothers, and pupil nurses, and the *Vooruit* encourages its members to help. The Society for Helping Mothers is only a nominal advisory board to the doctor, who thus carries on almost single-handed this splendid work. And yet a more modest man never lived. In his reports, which are all issued in the name of the 'Ville de Gand,' his own name is never mentioned, he simply appears as 'the doctor of the Society.'

'When I am gone,' he said earnestly, 'the town *must* feel responsible and *must* carry on this work, as it is all done in their name. They get all the credit, and receive all the awards and medals.' I feel that it is the least tribute I can pay to this generous and public-spirited

man to mention his name in connection with a work which is practically unique, as nowhere else is there, as far as I know, such a *complete* system of fighting infant mortality. Babies' dispensaries have been opened in France and Turin, while New York and many towns in England have established milk depots and health visitors, but it is Dr. Miele alone who has inaugurated a School for Mothers, and who trains the future as well as the present generation of mothers in the care of infants. Which of our philanthropic societies will be the first to follow his example in England, or will the work be undertaken by friendly or co-operative societies, or by trade unionists, or perhaps by wealthy individuals? Or will it be taken up by municipalities, or by education committees? Why should not every elementary school contain a dispensary for babies, where the elder girls could be trained, as the daughters of artisans are being trained in Ghent? Must we wait for the enlightened Socialist State to take definite action to stop the terrible waste of infant life in England? We are told by Dr. Newman, in his valuable book on Infant Mortality (recently published), that our infant death rate is not declining, though our general death rate is. Children under twelve months of age die in England to-day in as great numbers as they did seventy years ago. And this means that we are suffering not only a loss of 120,000 infant lives every year, while our birth rate is declining, but it also indicates a prevalence of those causes and conditions which in the long run determine a serious degeneration of race.

ALYS RUSSELL.

THE 'VIRGINIUS' INCIDENT AND CUBA

THE excitement in Cuba, which was responsible for the appearance of American men-of-war in the harbours of the island, instinctively carried the mind back through thirty-three years to that occasion when the United States sloop-of-war *Juanita* arrived at Santiago, and the war-ship *Wyoming*, under Commander Hushing, followed her, not for the purpose of imposing American authority on the island, but to prevent the completion of an act which, had it gone unchecked, might—nay, would—have resulted in the liberation of Cuba from Spanish rule, and have anticipated the Spanish-American war by a quarter of a century.

It was the time of what is known as the *Virginus* incident, when the steamer of that name was captured by the Spanish gunboat *Tornado*, and several men, including British and American citizens, were shot. The execution of the Americans—the slaughter, as it was called—incensed the feeling of the United States to such a pitch of indignation that meetings were held in many of the large cities, and war funds were subscribed to purchase ships and munition to demand restitution from Spain for the act of her representatives in Cuba. It would scarcely be going too far to assume that, judging from the contemporary records, the excitement was almost greater in America at that time than it was even during the late war, in which the independence of Cuba was evolved.

It was, it need hardly be said at this late day, to help the evolution of that independence that the *Virginus* started on her mission, which nearly embroiled Great Britain in a war with Spain. It was, indeed, the vigorous action of one man, and one man alone, which prevented that disaster, as it prevented the slaughter, under the false designation of execution, of a hundred prisoners who had been condemned after a hole-and-corner trial. The man whose resolution and decision saved the situation was my father, the late Altamont de Cordova, from whom I once learnt the particulars I now record, to add a new chapter to the story which has been told in many books. In order that the situation may be the better understood it is advisable to recall, in a rapid and succinct manner, the condition of affairs as they then were.

For some years a sort of guerilla warfare had been carried on by the Cubans, having for its ultimate object the expulsion of the Spaniards, after the Revolution in Spain in 1868. During those years Jamaica offered an asylum to the Cuban refugees, who deemed it expedient to escape while there was yet time from the clutches of Spain. There is little doubt, therefore, that many of the plots which were hatched against Spanish rule at the time, were conceived in Kingston, the city in which the most important, at all events, of the Cubans took up their residence.

It was on the 20th of October, 1873, that the steamer *Virginus* arrived at Kingston, with 159 souls on board. She was consigned to my father, who was then living in that city, where our people had lived for generations. At the time of the Inquisition they left Spain rather than give up their religion and took refuge in the island, in common with other Spanish families who had to flee for a similar reason. There, they remained when Jamaica was annexed by Great Britain under the Commonwealth, and to-day their descendants still flourish, and not only bear the old Spanish names but preserve all the old Spanish characteristics, so that, though English to the backbone in thought and act and feeling, they bear a close physical resemblance to the subjects of King Alfonso. My father was well known as a great advocate of Cuban independence, which he just lived to see achieved as the outcome of the Spanish-American war. He was *persona grata* with all the Cuban refugees, who realised that their cry, 'Viva Cuba libre y independiente!' was the watchword of his life, even as it was of their own.

When the *Virginus* arrived in Kingston she was in a leaky condition, and the captain wanted to have her thoroughly repaired before starting for Port Limon, which was her destination. The ship was flying the American flag, and while there is no doubt that the ultimate destination of many of the passengers was Cuba she herself was bound for Port Limon, a fact of which a great deal was made at the time. For three or four days the *Virginus* remained in the harbour, while such repairs as were possible were executed by the local engineers. To test her she was given a trial trip in Kingston Harbour, and everybody was delighted with the result. There was only one dissentient voice. It was my father's.

To celebrate the preparedness of the steamer for her voyage a ball was given in honour of the principals of the expedition, and was largely attended by the wealthy Cubans who had found a friendly asylum in Kingston, and their English friends. My father was a great Freemason at the time, and held an exalted position in the affairs of the craft. Indeed, he ruled East Jamaica masonically for several years. A few days before the *Virginus* started he himself conferred on Bernabé Varona, a leader of the expedition, one of the higher degrees in masonry. As a memento of what was to him a

very interesting occasion my father took from his coat a masonic jewel he was wearing at the time and gave it to Varona, and a day or two later he also presented him with his photograph taken in masonic regalia. That little jewel and that photograph subsequently played no insignificant part in the tragedy which was to follow.

Amid such rejoicings the *Virginus* left Jamaica. To speed the parting guests a large party of their English friends and the Cuban residents went down the harbour on the steamer, returning later by steam yachts chartered for the purpose. As the *Virginus* passed down the harbour and out beyond Port Royal my father drew attention to the fact that her behaviour was justifying the dissatisfaction he had expressed at the trial trip. He pointed out that the generation of steam was defective and that the pressure recorded by the gauges was not sufficient. He therefore strongly advised that they should return and remedy these defects. No one would listen to him. The blood of the leaders was up. 'We have started,' they cried; 'we will go on.' They went on. It was magnificent, but it was not prudence.

Then came the first dramatic moment in the tragedy, which teemed with drama. The men were assembled on deck, and my father, introduced by the commanding officer as the 'dear friend of Cuba,' made a short address to them. As he bade them good-bye and God-speed, preparatory to going down the ladder to the steam yacht to return to Kingston, Varona stepped forward, and throwing his arms about him said, 'A few nights ago you gave me this jewel. It is on my breast to-day,' and he pointed to the little masonic emblem he was wearing. 'If I die fighting for the liberty of Cuba I will die with that pinned on my breast.' Only a few days later he was led out to be shot. The jewel was still pinned to his breast.

It was in that way that the expedition started. It will be well, therefore, to recall the events in the order they happened, before showing how it was that the lives of the majority of those on board were saved, and one or possibly two wars which might have been the outcome were prevented. For these events I draw on the story told in the *New York Herald* some few years ago, by Mr. Alexander Estrada, one of the survivors of the expedition.

• During the afternoon, after the departure of the *Virginus*, the members of the expedition were in high spirits. Songs were sung and stories told, and they turned in early to get a good night's rest after the day's excitement and the junketing of the previous night. Before daylight, however, the clanking of the pumps awakened them to the fact that the repairs had not been satisfactorily made and the steamer had sprung a leak. She put into Jeremie, in Hayti, where the leak was repaired, and she put to sea again, only to have to put in at Port au Prince for additional repairs. Once again they touched Caymito, and the captain, Joseph Fry, believing that everything was then all

right, started for Port Limon on the afternoon of the last day of October. Among the leaders of the expedition, besides Varona, were W. A. C. Ryan, an American officer who had fought in the Civil War and was commonly called General, Jesus del Sol, and Pedro Cespedes.

About four o'clock in the afternoon [wrote Mr. Estrada] a steamer hove in sight, which after a while was recognised as a Spanish man-of-war, the *Tornado*. She was then about ten miles off, but she fired a gun, for those on board the *Virginus* saw the cloud of white smoke and heard the dull boom of the explosion. The captain turned the head of the *Virginus* for Jamaica and the chase began. The *Virginus* was making ten knots an hour, the *Tornado* was making twelve.

'If we can hang him up until nightfall I think I shall be able to get you away,' said Captain Fry. Then he turned to the engineer and asked, 'Can't you give her more steam? We are losing steadily.'

'I am afraid of the boilers,' said the engineer, 'but if you say so I will give them the top notch.'

'Let her go for all she is worth,' replied Captain Fry.

A few minutes later the creaking and racking of the old steamer was increased tenfold. She seemed like some great leviathan flying in agony from a deadly pursuer. Under this new impetus she held her own until the verge of nightfall. Then the captain came aft with a white face. 'What is the matter?' asked one of the Cubans. 'I am afraid we will have to give up,' was the reply; 'the shaking of the ship has loosened the calking and we are leaking badly.'

Our speed had decreased to seven knots. Five miles away the Spaniard was coming up hand over foot, her bulwarks crowded with dark faces. Still the captain did not stop the ship. At four miles the Spaniards tried another shot at us. The big ball went careering and bounding through the sea and four cable-lengths to starboard fell short, but luckily did not glance from the waves, as it was a line shot and would have hulled us.

A third and fourth shot followed, the latter snarling by so close to the rigging that we ducked apprehensively. At the fifth trial the smokestack rang and vibrated as though struck by a giant hammer, one of the nine cables fell with a great clatter, knocking one of the deck hands senseless.

'The jig is up,' cried the captain; 'round her to and stop the engines.' Around came the *Virginus* in a great sweep, with the American flag still flying from her forepeak. 'That will protect us at any rate,' we thought. Up came the Spaniard at top speed, with the foam flying from her bows, whereon we could make out the name *Tornado*.

She rounded to within a short distance from the *Virginus*, and a moment later two large cutters with thirty men and two officers put off and rowed alongside. They tumbled over the bulwarks, their faces black with supercilious anger.

Without stopping to make inquiries one of the officers turned upon us and cried, 'Take down that damned flag!'

One of the *Virginus* passengers, a mere boy—I think it was Edward Scott—said, 'Take it down yourself.' And they did. The American flag was torn down and the red and yellow flag of Spain was set in its place. As it came down the Spanish officers grabbed it and trampled it underfoot.

Captain Fry handed over his papers. They were regular enough, but the Spanish captain crumpled them angrily in his hand. We made no resistance, for such a thing was useless. In half an hour everybody, with the exception of Captain Fry and the engineer, was tightly bound and transferred to the *Tornado*.

And how those thongs did hurt ! We were handled like sacks of meal and thrown about at the pleasure of our captors. Before leaving the *Virginus* we were thoroughly searched. It was not possible to hide anything from them, because they stripped us of all our clothes.

Very queer we looked too, standing 'in half-naked groups among the gorgeously-uniformed Spanish officers. General Ryan sneered so openly at the Spaniards that I fully expected to see him killed upon the spot. Having taken every article that could have contributed in the least to our comfort, our captors for a time turned their attention to other things. The American flag was spread upon the deck, and occasionally a Spanish officer would come forward to trample and spit upon it. 'That means war, boys, if we ever get out of this,' said Ryan.

The prisoners were taken to Santiago. As soon as the news of the capture was made known the city was illuminated, and men marched in triumph through the streets, accompanied by bands of music. The next day two courts were held. One of them, according to Mr. Estrada, was 'for the disposition of the crew and the other for those claiming to be passengers. General Ryan, Del Sol, Cespedes, and Varona were taken to the first-named court, where they appealed to the American consul in vain for aid.'

On the morning of the 3rd of November these four men were placed in cells apart from the others. 'They remained there until the following morning, when they were called out by a Spanish officer, who, with a guard of soldiers, marched them past the large stone room where we were confined. We could see them going by. Ryan called out, "I guess it is death this time. Good-bye, boys, and good luck."'

It was death. The leaders of the expedition had been led out to be executed.

Mr. Estrada continues :

On the following day we were taken before the Court of Marine and asked if there had been arms or ammunition on board the *Virginus*. We replied in the negative. This was repeated on the 5th of November. A document stating that the *Virginus* was a filibuster was presented for our signatures, and again we refused to sign it.

Several of the Spanish officers drew their swords, and under threat of instant death some of my companions signed the paper, but it is only fair to say that they afterwards repented bitterly.

It was the original plan of the Spaniards not to spare a single life. At our last hearing Captain Fry and thirty-nine of his companions were condemned to be shot on the 8th of November. My name was among the ill-fated forty. By this time suffering had made me apathetic, and I heard the sentence with nothing worse than a tumultuous beating of my heart. After sentence had been passed on Captain Fry and the rest of us General Burriel, the brutal commandant of Santiago, learned that the British warship *Niobe* would leave Kingston on the 6th of November and would arrive at Santiago on the following day.

As sixteen of those upon whom sentence had been passed were English the date of execution was set for the 7th instead of the 8th, in order to head off any possible interference from the *Niobe*.

On the morning of the fatal day the same officer and the same squad of soldiers who were responsible for the death of poor Ryan and his companions



appeared at the door of the large bare room where we were confined, and our names were called out one by one. As each name was called out we stepped to one side without even a chance of saying good-bye to our companions, many of whom were weeping. It was 'Á Dios' ('Good-bye') all round, and then we were marched clanking down the long hall to a chapel, where we could prepare our souls for eternity. It was shortly past eight o'clock when we reached the chapel. I was in the rear with Antonio Deloyo and could see all of my companions. Some of them sat gazing at the intoning priests, calmly, unflinchingly. Others bowed their heads on their hands. A few knelt in prayer. Captain Fry held his chin in the air and did not seem to notice his surroundings.

Behind us the muskets of the guards rattled and clanked as they moved to and fro, and in front of us the black-robed priests were intoning a Mass for the repose of our souls. It was good of the Spaniards to trouble themselves about our future welfare. We remained in this chapel for six mortal hours, and the strain of it was something terrific.

The morning soon crept up to the noon hour and began to slant along into the afternoon. Our guards had grown rather somnolent when with a solemn clatter of footsteps we filed out of the chapel and formed two abreast outside.

As I passed I was told to step to one side where three of my companions stood. They were Hermínus Quesada, Augustin Santa Rosa, and José Boitel. 'We have been reprieved for a time at least,' said Boitel to me. Then we stood and waved 'Good-bye' to our comrades as they stumped slowly away in a dead march toward a little tile-roofed building with a long wall of stone.

Those who had been detailed to guard us felt that they had been defrauded of a legitimate sport. They were not to take part in the *battue*. But they could at least look on unobserved. So, with many a blow and curse, we were marched down past the slaughter-house, moving very slowly on our way to the prison, in order that no notice should be taken of our deflection. Over by the slaughter-house we saw the prisoners standing in a squad near the wall. Some of them held their heads up proudly, defiantly. Others looked as though death would have been a relief. The Spanish sergeant ran hither and thither, grabbing each man by the shoulders and placing him against the wall. I saw no blind-folding, no untying of the hands.

Finally the entire thirty-seven prisoners were placed against the wall in a long line, ready for the slaughter. In fact, the place was a slaughter-house, used for the butchering of cattle.

There was no delay in carrying out the horrible programme to the end. The guards were resting arms, in front of the prisoners, in a long line. There were about fifty of them, as near as I can remember. Suddenly the Spanish officer in command of the execution gave a loud, shrill order, and up came a long level line of steel barrels. I did not notice any shrinking in the attitude of the prisoners along the wall. There were no moans, no cries for mercy.

'Are you ready? One—two—three—fire!' There came a rattling volley and a white cloud of smoke streamed past the line of soldiers. When it drifted away the whole horrid sight burst upon us as though from the setting of a stage.

It was the arrival of the *Niobe* which prevented the execution of the remainder of the prisoners. How it was that she came to be sent on her life-saving errand has yet to be told. The incidents were once related to me by my father, who, as the consignee of the *Virginus*, was, if not the first to receive the information of her capture, one of the earliest to do so, for her fate concerned him deeply.

The news of the execution created consternation not merely among the Cubans, but among the English citizens who sympathised

with them, and Kingston seethed with excitement. My father immediately cabled to the United States consul at Santiago for confirmation of the truth of the message. It was more than confirmed, for the consul cabled that eighty more of the crew had been condemned to be shot the next morning. It was then nearly four o'clock in the afternoon.

At all costs my father determined that that abominable outrage must be averted. He went at once to the head of the telegraph office in Kingston and asked him to verify the despatches as having been received. Then he prevailed upon that official to order the cable office in Kingston to remain open all night if necessary, and to instruct the cable office at Santiago not to close until the Kingston office gave it leave to do so. Such precautions would be unnecessary in these days, but at that time the business community of Kingston did not use the cable to any great extent, and the ordinary office hours were from eight in the morning until five in the afternoon. Had the precaution not been taken there would have been no possibility of saving those men; for, even if one of the telegraph operators in Kingston had been summoned from his home after business hours, there would have been no possibility of getting into touch with his colleague at Santiago.

Thirty years ago the only means of communicating with the Commodore at Port Royal was by going thither in a boat, and under favourable conditions it took an hour to run across the harbour. There was no telegraph in those days, no telephone of course, and it was by no means easy to get even a steam-launch without fairly long notice. After sending a messenger to order a little sailing boat my father went to the acting vice-consul of the United States, the consul and vice-consul being both away, and prevailed upon him to cable to the commander of the United States man-of-war *Wyoming*, stationed in Colon, ordering him to start for Santiago without a moment's delay. Then my father went to Port Royal. Commodore de Horsey, who was in command of the station, naturally knew my father and saw him without delay. The situation was explained to him, and he was asked to take immediate action to prevent the executions that had been arranged for next morning. It was a grave position for the Commodore to face. He, evidently wanted to temporise.

'In what capacity do you call on me?' he asked.

'As the consignee of the *Virginus*, as a British subject, as one holding her Majesty's commission as a justice of the peace, or in any capacity which will soonest obtain a hearing for me,' said my father.

The two cablegrams from the American vice-consul in Santiago, giving the facts of the case, were shown to the Commodore. He read them and handed them back, saying, 'I don't see what I can

do in the matter. It is now five o'clock, and the telegraph office closes at that hour. Even if I wanted to send a message I have no opportunity of doing so.'

'But, Commodore,' said my father, 'you cannot suppose I have not provided against that. The office in Kingston as well as the office in Santiago will be kept open all night, if necessary, and they will not be shut until I give instructions that they may be.'

Still the Commodore wavered. 'I hardly see what I can do, Mr. de Cordova; what is it you ask?'

'That you send a telegram protesting against further executions, and that you send a vessel of war to Santiago de Cuba immediately.'

Still the Commodore was loth to act. 'I have only one vessel in the harbour, and I must keep her for an emergency.'

'I respectfully submit that the emergency has arisen,' was the prompt reply.

'The *Niobe* is the only vessel I have, and she is not ready for sea,' said the Commodore.

'But in her Majesty's service a vessel not ready for sea can be got ready in two hours.'

Short as the conversation was, the earnestness and gravity of the visitor had its effect. The Commodore rose, and, asking to be excused in order to see what he could do, left the room. In ten minutes he returned with a message written on a half-sheet of note-paper. He handed it to my father, saying, 'Mr. de Cordova, here is a telegram which you will please have sent to Cuba. I have signalled to Sir Lambton Loraine, the captain of the *Niobe*, to have his vessel prepared for sea at once and come ashore for orders. She will be on her way to Cuba before eight o'clock to-night.'

With a few words of thanks to the Commodore my father put the telegram into his pocket, went back to Kingston, and cabled the message, the exact wording of which he did not recall when he told me the story over twenty years after the incident had happened. In effect, however, the message was: 'Commodore de Horsey protests, in her Britannic Majesty's name, against further execution of persons on *Virginus* pending arrival of her Majesty's sloop *Niobe*, which leaves this evening for Cuba.'

It went to the English vice-consul, Mr. Theodore Brooks, who protested formally 'in the name and by order of Commodore A. C. de Horsey, commanding the naval force of her Britannic Majesty's navy in the West Indies, against the execution of sixteen individuals on the *Virginus* who claim to be British subjects.' It was this protest which practically stopped the executions.

When the Governor of Santiago received the message he is described by one who was present as having stamped and raved 'like a mad-man,' but he recognised that it was impossible for him to refuse to act in accordance with that protest.

The rest of the story has been told by Mr. Estrada.

Something like the following messages passed quickly between the ship and the shore :

The English captain to General Burriel : ' What is the meaning of the shooting now going on ? '

General Burriel to the English captain : ' We are only shooting some prisoners. '

The English captain to General Burriel : ' Are there any English subjects among them ? '

General Burriel to the English captain : ' No, only Americans. '

The English captain to General Burriel : ' If you shoot another prisoner, either English or American, until I can investigate the facts I will bombard the town. '

Here is diplomacy for you [continued the survivor] and of the very best kind. It was a diplomacy that saved our lives, although it came too late to save the lives of many of our poor companions.

General Burriel [he adds] was furious over the interference of the commander of the *Niobe*.

At the same time the United States ship *Wyoming* arrived, and so did the United States sloop-of-war *Juanita*. Eventually the prisoners were released. Before that happened, however, they had to undergo a great many hardships, with which I need not here concern myself.

Two or three additional personal incidents in connection with the story will not be without interest. The two most popular men on the expedition were undoubtedly Varona and Ryan. Although I was only a child at the time I can still remember the impression they produced on me when I was told they were going to fight for the freedom of Cuba, and I can still recall the enthusiasm they and their cause never failed to awaken in the people. Ryan was very tall, and to my childish eyes he seemed almost gigantic. The impressiveness of his appearance was intensified by his clean-shaven face, his long hair, and the sombrero he wore, while Varona, slight and of middle height, I remember, was always spoken of as one of the handsomest men my father had ever known.

There was a strange fatalism about Ryan. In spite of the fact that everybody called him ' General ' he had only really risen to the rank of lieutenant in the American Civil War, in which he had been wounded some twenty times. Over and over again when discussing the Cuban enterprise and the possibility of the death, from Spanish bullets, of those who were taking part in it, he used to say, ' I shall never die by a bullet. I know it. They have tried hard to kill me, as you see by these wounds, but they never succeeded and they never will. '

He, with Varona, Cespedes, and Jesus del Sol made up the first four who were executed. The other three fell dead at the first volley. He fell too, but was only wounded, not killed. He did not die until a soldier ran forward and put a bayonet or sword through his heart. Then they cut off his head and Varona's, put them on

pikes, and carried them through the streets, to the delight of the populace.

Among Varona's possessions the Spanish authorities found my father's photograph. Everyone in Cuba knew his name, the Cubans as the man they loved and venerated, the Spaniards as the man they hated. How great was that hate was exemplified by the fact that after Varona had been shot they put the photograph up in the market-place and riddled it with bullets.

My father did not say so in terms to me, but I have heard from other sources that the Spanish authorities declared that the same fate would have been meted out to him had he ventured to go to Cuba. The truth of this statement is borne out by the fact that only a short time later my father wanted to go to Santiago de Cuba. He applied to the Spanish consul in Kingston for a passport. The Spanish consul, who was a friend, refused. My father pressed the point. Again the consul refused. A third, a fourth, a fifth time my father made the request. Each time the consul was more vehement in his refusal. At last he said, 'I will not give you a passport.' My father asked the reason. The consul replied, 'If you go to Cuba your arrival will be known in a few hours, and then—the Spaniards have knives and pistols. No one will know how it happened, but your body will tell the tale. No; go home and tell Mrs. de Cordova I have saved your life to-day by refusing your request.'

Two or three weeks after the 'Virginus incident' one of my brothers was born. He was named Varona, after my father's dear friend, and for a second name was given that of Agramonte, after another famous Cuban patriot. On his first birthday the Cubans of Kingston gave him a silken Cuban flag, and startled my people by quite unexpectedly assembling one night after they had gone to bed to serenade them in honour of the event. As a little boy my brother Varona was always called the 'son of Cuba,' and I have heard my father say that many of the exiles considered he belonged far more to them than he did to him.

RUDOLPH DE CORDOVA.



PHYSICAL TRAINING IN STOCKHOLM AND COPENHAGEN

THE constant activity which characterises the normal condition of young children when awake is increasingly recognised to be one among many other factors indispensable to healthy growth and development. It is well known that this restless vivacity, which would almost appear to be the solution of that oft-quoted problem of the possibility of perpetual motion, is Nature's favourite method of securing to her children nutrition, education, and experience. Active movements quicken respiration, assist circulation and absorption, promote excretion, lay down nerve tracks, and establish co-ordination between brain and muscles. Coincidentally the senses are exercised, and useful perceptions of space and time, texture and resistance, are developed, while courage, resourcefulness, and many other ethical qualities are cultivated. There is little occasion to labour the point; the importance of exercise and of opportunities for its enjoyment are quite generally accepted to-day. When the early years of life are passed under natural conditions the forms assumed by this ceaseless activity, and the quantity as well as the quality of the exercise taken, may be safely left to individual inclination. The child will constantly crawl and climb, shout and sing, race and wrestle with his companions, to his own intense satisfaction and to the benefit of his physical and moral being. It is true that the child's movements will be in accordance with the dictates of the moment, but the moments are few in his waking hours when the promptings of his heart do not incite him to attempt feats of skill and displays of strength, to experiment with his untried powers, or to indulge his insatiable impulse to imitation. Very different are the conditions and tastes of children bred to an artificial city existence. They are too often debilitated by unwholesome food and surroundings, wearied with premature work, or stunted, sometimes even deformed, by the enforced sedentary occupations of school life or by unduly severe and prolonged labour. In such children natural spontaneity dwindles and disappears, the frolics of childhood give place to precocious maturity. For children such as these not only must opportunities for varied

activity be provided, but actual incentives must be afforded to what ought to be natural exercise.

It is a well-recognised fact that the apparently simple proves to be infinitely complex when subjected to scientific examination; it is therefore not surprising that in the by no means remote past people interested in the physical welfare of children believed that their needs could be met by such exercises as might fitly form a part of the ordinary school programme. For instance, movements admirable for the rank and file of the army were tried, but proved to be unsuited to immature boys, growing girls, and school babies. To introduce exercises of a more educational type, specially designed to assist in the development of the muscles and organs of the body, as well as to correct its asymmetrical tendencies, has proved no light task for those who are responsible for this department in the school curriculum. There were prejudices to overcome and incidental expenses to be met. The want of suitable accommodation for the purpose in the schools was scarcely so great an obstacle as the difficulty of securing space for the subject in crowded time-tables; while considerable diversity of opinion obtained as to what series of exercises should be adopted for school use, and to whom teachers should look for guidance, training, and support in the new departure. In the opinion of some authorities recreation alone should characterise school exercises; all that was needed was that tired minds should be refreshed, and nerve tension relaxed. Therefore they supported the practice of earlier years in this country, pointing out that musical accompaniment manifestly stimulated flagging energy, and that the skilful handling of wands and Indian clubs gratified the girls; that exercises on parallel bars and with apparatus primarily planned for adults aroused enthusiasm in the boys; therefore, they argued, why discontinue their use? Only by very gradual steps were those in authority led to perceive that to justify their employment in schools, all exercises must be planned on strictly systematic and scientific lines; they must be recognised as a means of definite mental as well as physical education; and, above all, they must be scientifically adapted to individual needs. Serious work, not merely enjoyable recreation, must therefore characterise the exercises carried on in schools. It is not to be expected that the scope of the question of a choice of systems should be easily perceived by the public; it calls for expert knowledge and prolonged study. Nevertheless, all will concede that to those who approach the field of controversy with an open mind, the point of supreme importance is undoubtedly the ultimate benefit to be derived by the child, for whose needs, physical and physiological, this battle of systems and relative values is being waged. It is obvious that school exercises must be suited to different age periods, must be adapted not only to boys and girls in general, but to a great variety of individual temperaments, varied physical abilities and states of nutrition. They should

be progressive in character ; safeguarded from risk of strain or damage to immature frames and organs ; they must possess variety and be planned to produce organic efficiency as well as general symmetry, and they should stimulate zeal and interest.

With the object of securing uniformity and intelligent practice in the elementary schools of the country, an inter-departmental committee was appointed in 1904 to consider 'The Model Course of Physical Exercises.' As a result of their deliberations a modified edition of exercises, based on the lines of those usually described as Swedish, was issued for use in schools by order of the Board of Education ; and thanks to the energy and experience of Colonel Fox, his Majesty's Inspector of Physical Training, much interest has been aroused in many parts of the country in this new 'Model Course of Physical Exercises.' These exercises are briefly described as 'nutritive' and 'corrective' in their intention ; they are performed without the accompaniment of music, and demand for their accurate execution considerable concentration of the mind and control of the body ; that is, they are as educational in intention, and, if properly performed, in practice, as mathematics, grammar, or elementary science. They have, however, perforce been planned in compliance with the dictum that 'half a loaf is better than no bread' ; that is, they embrace free standing movements only, none of those exercises with Swedish apparatus being included, which, as a matter of fact, constitute an essential part of the Swedish system, and lend great zest to the pupil's work. Careful inquiries recently prosecuted upon this particular point resulted in abundant evidence that the true Swedish system of physical training cannot be carried out unless this specially designed apparatus, known as Swedish, be employed. The exercises which depend upon the use of rib stools, booms, ropes, and jumping apparatus constitute an integral part of an indivisible whole ; while the very evident psychological influence of suitable apparatus must also be given its full value ; this, by the way, is most unquestionable, and is amply justified by the observations made on many hundred children in a large number of schools.

Unfortunately English educational authorities since when sudden demands for extra expenditure, especially on a new subject, are put forward ; therefore tact and discretion have had to pare to its smallest dimension the thin edge of the wedge of progress in physical training, and we must look to the gradual growth of an intelligent public opinion to supply the force necessary to drive it home. To ask at once for the widespread introduction of rib stools and booms might scare those whose duty it is to safeguard the ratepayers' pockets ; only by very gradual demands based upon public conviction can this essential end be attained. Meanwhile, in consequence of the absence of any but free standing movements the exercises are liable to suffer from monotony on constant repetition, becoming but measures of

disciplinary duty to all concerned. For this among other reasons a section of those deeply interested in the physical development of our young people still urgently insist that Indian clubs and dumb-bells, parallel bars and trapeze, should not be discarded, for, it is pleaded, that like music they stimulate interest, and relieve monotony, in addition to the skill and agility they produce. Without doubt, free standing movements alone are an insufficient form of physical training; for instance, the important heaving exercises as well as jumping, vaulting, and many others, are compulsorily omitted, while courage, energy, dexterity, indeed all the finer mental and muscular qualities, remain undeveloped. The apparatus employed must be designed to demand absolute accuracy and precision in its use; the exercises into which it enters must be strictly such as cause no risk of endangering young bodies; the whole system of which it constitutes a part must be in one word scientific. And this is what the Swedish system most justly claims to be.

The Swedish system of physical exercises has been perfected through a century of probation and gradual development. It has been, or is being, adopted in the schools of France and Belgium, Denmark and Greece, as well as in many of the States of America. Rumour whispers that the German Emperor proposes to supersede existing methods in its favour, and it has been recently accepted with unqualified success by the English navy. Expert exponents of this system are teaching it in a large number of girls' high schools in Great Britain, and the National League for Physical Education and Improvement is considering its adoption, believing it to be the best means of physical training in this country. Under these circumstances it is thought that special interest will attach to the following brief *résumé* of observations made, and expert opinions gathered, during a recent visit to Stockholm and Copenhagen, made for the express purpose of investigating the subject on the spot. Every facility was generously afforded by all concerned in each city. Nearly four weeks were spent in visiting schools and colleges; many hours were passed in watching not only the skilled performances of men and women in training as teachers, but classes of boys and girls, ranging in age from six years to twenty, drawn from every social grade, and consequently of very varied physique and nutrition. Some classes were conducted by experts in physical training, others by ordinary class teachers. The observations made on the classes were reduced to writing, submitted to the frank criticism of men and women of wide practical experience in the whole subject, and were by them endorsed as correct.

All authorities in both countries agree that nine to ten years is the earliest admissible age for the systematic practice of physical exercises. Introduction to such definite training by means of active games and exercises of a more or less playful character may, however,

be employed from six years old and upwards. In these infant classes use is made of very simple apparatus. The simple exercises practised form a groundwork from which the transition to systematic exercises can be skilfully and progressively effected by a well-trained teacher. Young children, above all others, need concrete methods of training; therefore, though no effort to institute a definite series of movements is permitted, suitable apparatus is considered necessary, as without it the climbing and other antics peculiar to the children's stage of development could not be performed. Nevertheless, essential as is this activity, anything in the form of corrective exercises would be premature and unnecessary before nine or ten years of age. Slow marching is branded as futile for infants, muscular co-ordination being insufficient to permit of the accuracy which constitutes the object of the exercise; and breathing exercises are also considered valueless, because the degree of intelligence essential to their proper execution does not develop much before eight years of age.

It was evident that children from ten to thirteen attained considerable proficiency and showed great interest in the performance of Swedish exercises, either free standing, or with booms, rib stools, ropes, and jumping apparatus. Experience also showed that healthy girls and boys could profitably follow the same scheme of training during this age period—a point of great advantage in rural schools where, on account of the small number of pupils, and the fact that they are usually of very varied ages, it is difficult to form separate classes of either boys or girls of approximately the same age and physical condition without unduly multiplying classes and overtaxing the time at the command of the teacher.

Opinion was unanimous that in the case of girls a falling off in both proficiency and zeal is associated with the rapid growth, especially in weight, which usually occurs between thirteen and seventeen. At this age a languor and loss of interest become apparent in the case of at least two-thirds of the girls, which are connected by all the most experienced observers, men as well as women, with the developmental changes usual at this period. So strong is this opinion that the majority of teachers and heads of girls' schools deprecate enforced attendance at physical training classes for girls during these years, unless circumstances permit the coincident relaxation of mental exertion, with its attendant fatigue. Light exercises of a somewhat different character, especially æsthetic dancing, should, they say, be employed to replace the more arduous forms of physical training. Where these have been accorded a fair trial it is found that they are not only sufficient to promote good circulation and digestion, but that they appeal to the imagination and stimulate the flagging interest of girls at this difficult age. However, even these forms of exercise are better omitted if hard or prolonged mental work, such as preparation for exacting competitive examinations, is required. The subjects of

such well-meant endeavours to combine physical efficiency with mental attainments too often pay a heavy price, not only in present disappointment and anæmia, but in subsequent debility and disgust. Of the two evils insufficient physical development or asymmetry must be preferred to the exhaustion of overwork, when due allowance cannot be made for the unstable condition of adolescent girls.

With respect to the frequency of lessons, it is the present custom both in Stockholm and Copenhagen, that in elementary schools there should be two or three lessons a week, lasting from twenty-five to forty minutes, according to the age of the pupils; whereas in secondary or higher schools, and in private schools, four to six lessons a week are customary, each lasting from thirty to forty-five minutes. Twenty-five minutes is considered quite inadequate, except for very young children; thirty to forty minutes constitute a good average time. It must not be thought that these are considered as other than provisional arrangements. The best authorities accept the fact that to derive real benefit from the Swedish system daily half-hour lessons are necessary; short of this the children benefit by the respite from sedentary desk work, but such mutilated exercises cannot be described as physical training, nor must definite beneficial results be anticipated. By slow degrees only does the public of any nation realise the full significance, physical, educational, and hygienic, of systematic bodily training. Only as this dawns on the understanding of school authorities will the subject be whole-heartedly included in school work and accorded the place to which it is entitled in the school curriculum. English enthusiasts may take heart when they call to mind that so little has as yet been gained for the children of Sweden and Denmark, in spite of the fact that physical training has been a nominal school subject for nearly a century.

There is a general consensus of opinion that the morning hours, preferably between 10 A.M. and noon, are the best for physical training, because muscular vigour is at its zenith at this time of day; in the earlier hours the tide of vitality has not risen to its height, and later it is impaired from fatigue. As it is obviously an absolute impossibility to afford the advantage of practice during these hours to all the children in a large school, it is customary in some of the higher schools in Copenhagen to change the time for this lesson for each class each week, so that no one set of children should be required to exercise for consecutive weeks or months at perhaps the least desirable period of the day.

Careful medical inspection is recognised as an indispensable safeguard to universal physical training. In the elementary schools of Stockholm the children are examined once each year, special intermediate inspection being made at the request of the teacher. In Copenhagen the inspection is more frequent, though apparently the same difficulty in respect of securing co-operation from parents exists

in these cities as in England: especially is this the case as regards treatment of defective eyesight, ear troubles, or the removal of adenoid growths. Children unfit for certain exercises are, however, carefully excluded, and asymmetrical conditions, such as curvature of the spine, are recognised in their early stages. In private schools the procedure varies, but careful observation appears to be the rule, and small classes are formed of pupils who need any special consideration or treatment.

Opinion is unanimous that a class of twenty pupils constitutes the limit for efficient training under one expert teacher. It is true that free standing movements *can* be satisfactorily performed by larger numbers, though correction of individuals is impossible; but for work with apparatus, vaulting and jumping, one teacher cannot supervise more than eight or ten pupils at a time. To meet this requirement the school classes of forty are split up into four or five subdivisions, under the care of as many children, selected from the class for their zeal and proficiency. This system of class leaders, to whom their companions render absolute and cheerful obedience, made a great impression upon English observers; there were no signs of 'swelled head' among the leaders, no traces of resentment or irritation among their companions. The 'squad system' is evidently an indispensable arrangement for class work with Swedish apparatus, and answers admirably well both in Copenhagen and Stockholm. Naturally more individual benefit is derived when such sections are under the care of students from one or other training centre, as is the case in Stockholm, where the Central Institute and Dr. Arvedson's gymnasium keep up a constant supply of interested students, to whom valuable opportunities for the acquirement of skill in observation as well as practice in teaching are thus afforded. In the hands of well-trained and sympathetic teachers pupils of all ages and of all conditions display intelligent interest and render ready obedience; signs of ennui and listlessness are entirely absent. This point cannot be over-emphasised, as want of enthusiasm and a low standard of performance characterise the pupils of insufficiently trained or unsympathetic teachers.

• The scheme of exercises employed is considered a matter of primary importance, and rigorous criticism is applied to those prepared by students for use in practising classes. For instance, the scheme must be judiciously progressive, not only from term to term but from week to week. Interest must be sustained and individual physique must be studied; each lesson must consist of an ordered and complete cycle of movements. A scheme providing for weekly or fortnightly variation and progression in the exercises performed is essential to the system, and equally indispensable is the subdivision method referred to above, which permits of selecting variants of each type of exercise, adapted to the needs and capacities of each small

group of pupils. In all cases, as has been said, certain children are exempted by medical orders from general class work. In higher class schools remedial exercises are employed for these cases, an advantage generally extended to children in elementary schools in Stockholm, but not as yet in Copenhagen. Anæmia, scoliosis, and heart disease are the most common causes for exemption, while dislocations, fractures, and sprains are not unknown. It is a growing custom to devote some part of the physical training hour to games. For the older pupils these are mostly revivals of old national singing games and dances; for the younger, variations are general of ball and other active games familiar in England. It is noteworthy that the selection consists chiefly of games which allow a large number of children (twenty to sixty) to take an active part in them, otherwise they are not considered advisable.

Gymnasias of varying size and efficiency are found in every school in both countries; they are provided and equipped by the local authority, but the State defrays the teachers' salaries. In Copenhagen these gymnasias are open every evening from 6 P.M. for use either by the older pupils or by young people in the neighbourhood, sufficient supervision being given in order that only desirable exercises should be performed. The good results are shown by the thousands that make use of this opportunity for exercise. The apparatus once installed, if of good quality, is practically indestructible.

The cost of apparatus in one such gymnasium which could accommodate forty to fifty pupils at a time is 130*l*. The apparatus consisted of:

30 Rib stools.	Plinth.
34 Small stools. .	2 Bocks—1 big, 1 small.
14 Straight ropes.	Jumping apparatus.
2 Oblique ropes.	4 Sets of double booms. .
2 Trapezes.	4 Saddles for booms.
2 Sets of rings. .	2 Ladders.
2 Window ladders.	2 Mats.
Horse.	1 Mattress.

The necessity for the costly double flooring seen in the Swedish gymnasias can be obviated by the central supports for the boom sliding back to the wall instead of having to be lowered under the top floor.

In Copenhagen far more attention is devoted to the matter of ventilation than in Stockholm, where, except at the Central Institute, it appears to be totally neglected. Speaking generally, Danish schools are airy and the atmosphere satisfactory. In the newer gymnasias heated air is introduced, though not under pressure; the large inlets being placed high up at one end of the hall, the outlets low down at the opposite end. To prevent dust a simple method of floor

sprinkling has been adopted, and is carried out by the pupils at frequent and specified intervals.

Suitable shoes of an excellent pattern are supplied by the local authorities for the use of children in "elementary schools; they cost about one shilling and sixpence a pair, and last usually from one and a half to two years. In Copenhagen the local authority supplies 150 gymnastic costumes made of galathea for girls to each school; these costumes are washed three times a year, unless any special occasion arises; they are shared by several children, an arrangement which may be compelled by lack of pence, but which is entirely unsatisfactory. Both shoes and dresses are kept in presses compactly arranged with numbered lockers and pegs; the children are trained to replace them with care and in strict order. Efforts are being made in Stockholm to provide a suitable dress for boys as well as girls; the latter, almost without exception, remove their skirts, and wear dark knickerbockers. It is considered that the interest in the matter of suitable costume as well as in the training generally is greater in country than in town schools in Denmark, partly on account of the parental enthusiasm fostered by the admirable union for shooting and gymnastics which has its members in every village and almost every homestead of the country. In rural schools, therefore, children generally provide their own costumes, white for boys and blue for girls; while the inspector of these rural schools constantly arranges meetings to stimulate interest among the scattered teachers. The general institution of weekly school baths in both Copenhagen and Stockholm has materially contributed to the provision of more satisfactory and suitable dress among lower-class children. During the three summer months swimming replaces physical exercises for all children in Copenhagen; two large swimming-baths in different quarters of the city allow for the attendance of many hundred children; they are open at all hours and an instructor is always present. The children receive two lessons weekly in swimming, but many voluntarily frequent the baths daily with immense benefit to their health. The depth of the water is carefully graduated to permit very young children to splash and paddle; and though plenty of fun and frolic is allowed, no child is ever permitted to be frightened by his companions. These baths are opened as soon as the temperature of the water reaches 63° Fahr., which usually happens towards the end of May or early in June.

There is a division of opinion on the matter of the employment of special or class teachers for the purpose of physical training. Professor Törngren, of the Central Institute, Stockholm, contends that only the former can be adequately trained for the purpose; whereas Herr Knudsen, Chief Inspector of Gymnastics in Denmark, is convinced that the teacher *must* be a member of the school staff if the subject is to be given its due place in the curriculum. Some experts maintain

that specialists are liable to overwork the pupils, and cannot exercise the constant and desirable daily influence on the carriage and posture of the children. On the other hand, it would appear that special teachers more often bring zest, vigour, and variety to the lessons, characteristics attributable to their better physique, wider experience, and greater command of the subject. It is, however, considered that they are liable to 'go stale,' and that the class teachers, though inclined, owing to pressure of other subjects, to slight the need for gymnastics, are more likely to consider the individual child, and to make allowances for fatigue or other disabilities of which they probably know the cause.

Most authorities in Stockholm are agreed that nothing less than two sessions, of eight months each, are required to train an expert teacher, because he must be thoroughly grounded in theory as well as in technique; such training, however, includes fencing and remedial exercises to which much time is devoted. Herr Knudsen strongly supports the one year State course of training now established for Danish teachers. This preparation he recognises to be but part of a great new movement. If the class teacher is, as he advocates, to conduct the physical exercises of his pupils, he cannot be expected to devote a longer period to special preparation for the purpose. This course at Copenhagen, which actually lasts eleven months, is devoted entirely to educational gymnastics; consequently the students gain in that respect an experience almost, if not quite, equal to those who train at the Central Institute in Stockholm. This course is considered sufficient for elementary school purposes; but in order to train teachers who intend to work in higher schools or in training colleges the Danish Ministry proposes to offer a second year's training every third year in the Central Institute about to be built in Copenhagen. This extra course would include instruction in remedial work and fencing, as well as in more advanced exercises. Great emphasis is laid upon the necessity for a thorough study of the anatomy of the muscular, nervous, respiratory, circulatory, and digestive organs; at Stockholm this is secured by actual dissection. The best authorities agree that physiology is even more important than anatomy to the pedagogic gymnast, because although anatomy must form the foundation of instruction, a knowledge of structure is in this case less important than that of function. Time must also be devoted to a careful study of the theory of movements. Professor Törngren dwelt upon the value of a third year spent on remedial exercises, even for the pedagogic gymnast, because they lead to a better understanding of the ordinary exercises, and impart increased ability to discriminate between fit and unfit children. It must be borne in mind that not only do all teachers in both countries go through some training in physical exercises during their four years' studentship, which now includes the theory of bodily movement, but that the State in each case defrays the whole cost of

training of special as well as general teachers. Applications from teachers for such training are most carefully sifted, and evidence is demanded of a previous knowledge of elementary chemistry, physics, and mechanics. Much stress is also laid upon a thorough training, under supervision, in class teaching of boys and girls of all ages.

Women teachers are usually employed to instruct women, girls and little boys; but during their training they themselves receive instruction from professors of both sexes. Holiday courses in the subject, lasting from two to four weeks, are provided every year in both Sweden and Denmark, and teachers who avail themselves of this extra training receive a maintenance grant. Each year shows a larger number of centres opened for rendering this assistance, especially to rural teachers.

The observations recorded in the foregoing pages left the impression that the children of all ages are agile, supple, light on their feet, and usually interested in physical training, invariably so when the teacher is sympathetic and bright. Free standing movements and marching are carried out by those from nine years old and upwards with military precision; carefully graded and selected exercises with rib stools and boom are perhaps the prime favourites, while leaping, vaulting, and rope climbing are executed with agility and enjoyment. During apparatus work and games great freedom is allowed, but evidence of good discipline is afforded by an invariable and prompt response to command. It must be confessed that in Stockholm good carriage is not invariable; the local authorities attribute this defect to prolonged desk work, badly designed seats, and the inadequate amount of physical training. Grace is often wanting among girls and young women, though it is hoped that this quality may be developed by means of the Folk dances now being generally introduced. It is difficult, of course, for visitors to estimate the effect of physical training upon the general health, chiefly in consequence of the prevalence of anæmia, and of a general delicacy of appearance especially noticeable in Stockholm. These defects are probably attributable to overheated rooms, defective ventilation, and inadequate diet. It is stated on the highest authority that undoubted physical improvement is in progress, though unfortunately the material is too vast to permit of definite scientific research and tabulation. In Copenhagen the children are ruddy and more robust in appearance, their carriage is better and their physique less delicate; but free dinners three times a week are the rule, and the ventilation of the schools is better. In neither country can the full beneficial results of such training be seen until some two or three generations have experienced its present, or even fuller, stage of development; it is, however, encouraging to learn that a striking difference is already seen in the physique of the recruits for the army in those country districts of Denmark where most attention has been given to the

subject and where most enthusiasm has been aroused among the population.

Careful inquiries were made as to the adequacy of what is still often described as 'Ling's System of Physical Training' to meet the requirements of the present day as defined by modern science. It is the firm conviction of Professor Törngren and Herr Knudsen that, in common with many other pioneers, Ling was so much in advance of his age that his intuitions have been justified by subsequent scientific observations; and that although he would possibly, indeed probably, fail to recognise the details of the modern interpretation of his work, his principles have survived, and constitute the enduring basis upon which all the superstructure of the existing Swedish system has been and is being built. It was freely conceded by Professor Törngren and others that further developments are inevitable and indeed desirable; especially is this the case where the system of physical training is adopted in other countries, where climate, temperament and other circumstances are widely different from those obtaining in Sweden. At the same time it was emphatically declared that if its fundamental principles be respected by those who assume the responsibilities of such developments; if its supervision be entrusted to really enthusiastic and well-trained teachers; if fair opportunities be provided in the form of time, place, and suitable apparatus for complete practice by the pupils, the Swedish system of physical training will justify its claims to promote healthful growth and development without risk to the most immature performer; it will stimulate courage, self-respect, and self-control, and will develop moral and mental as well as physical virtues.

MARY SCHARLIEB.

ALICE RAVENHILL.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES

As there are nearly 30,000 Friendly Societies, with thirteen millions of members, and nearly fifty millions of money, and as each of those thirteen millions has deposited his little store with his society in the full hope and expectation that it will come back to him in help when he wants it, the conditions that will secure that result constitute a subject of the greatest importance, and no time can be considered wasted which is necessary to ascertain what those conditions are. This may seem at first sight a dry and abstruse question, but when we reflect how easy it is to go wrong, and what a great misfortune the failure of a Friendly Society is, we shall find the matter one of really absorbing interest, and not quite so complicated as it seems. All I wish to say to every man of the thirteen millions is: 'Don't let your society fail to give you the help you want, for it can only do so by your own fault. You are the manager of it, for in the management of a Friendly Society every member has equal rights, and if it fails, it will fail because you personally have neglected to make yourself acquainted with the conditions of success, or if you did know them have neglected to enforce them upon your brother-members.'

Having thus appealed to so large an audience, let me illustrate my statement that it is easy to go wrong. There are many who seem to think that by paying so much a month, and clearing the slate of what remains at the end of the year, and dividing among the members all that is left after payment of the sick claims and expenses of the year, they are making a real provision for the future. There are others who seem to think that it does not matter what age you are when you join the society, and that all members ought to have the same benefits and pay the same contributions. There are others who think that if the society in any year does not spend all it receives, but adds something to its capital, it must necessarily be flourishing and prosperous. There are others who have visions of liberal allowances in sickness, to be continued as long as the member thinks fit to declare his inability to work, and to be insured by a very small monthly contribution. It is quite easy to fall into these delusions, but it is equally disastrous to entertain them, and a slight knowledge

of the economics of Friendly Societies would be sufficient to dispel them altogether.

For this reason, I have long been of opinion that the economics of the Friendly Society is a subject which ought to be taught in every elementary school in the kingdom. Who are the boys and girls in those elementary schools? They will be the members of the Friendly Societies of the next generation. The earlier the better. I should like to see every one, as soon as he leaves school and begins to earn wages, a member of a Friendly Society. If our aim is to be that to join a society is one of the first things he does after he leaves school, surely we ought also to provide that he shall be prepared for his duties as a member—which, as I have said, include the duties of a manager—by being taught the conditions of success and being warned against the fallacies which make for failure. You might as well set him to work at a trade without having learned how to use his tools, as make him a member of a Friendly Society without having learned how to make that society a success. There is still one thing more to be said upon that head: if the lads and lasses are to learn this, the masters and mistresses must know how to teach it. The first step, therefore, must be to introduce into the curriculum of every training college for masters and mistresses in the kingdom the subject of Friendly Societies—to teach every one who aspires to be a teacher the elementary actuarial doctrines upon which the success or failure of those societies depends, and to imbue his or her mind with the principles of thrift, foresight, providence, and equity of which a good Friendly Society is one of the best embodiments.

The first broad principle upon which Friendly Societies rest is the principle of average. Take a hundred healthy young men of the age of thirty. We know from the experience of Friendly Societies, derived from the observation of millions of cases, that some of those hundred young men will probably be unable to work through sickness during some part of the year before they attain the age of thirty-one, some for many days, some for few, but in the aggregate for 670 days. No one can tell beforehand who they will be, or how many they will be, or how long each man's sickness will last. We only know that some two or more of the hundred will cease to be wage-earners for a longer or shorter period, and that, so far as averages are to be depended upon, the total will mount up to 670 days, or in money value, if the intended allowance during incapacity to work is to be 2s. a day, to 67*l*. Now, the object of a Friendly Society being to supply a man who ceases temporarily to be a wage-earner through sickness with the means of subsistence, it is evident that can only be done by each member paying his share of this 67*l*. The amount therefore that each of the hundred would have to pay is 13*s*. 6*d*., that is, 67*l*. divided by 100, or, if he paid it in monthly instalments, it would be 1*s*. 1½*d*. per month. What each member thus pays is the

average sickness per member, and the total payment made is distributed to the members who are actually sick according to the duration of sickness in each case. 'Thus some members pay and get nothing; other members receive much more than they have paid, yet each man has received full value for his money. He has had it in the sense of security. He has been able to say to himself every night of the year: 'If I am taken ill to-morrow, and my wages stopped, I shall get two shillings a day from my club till I am well and again able to go to work.' If he has not had anything from the club, it is because he has not been ill and has continued to receive his wages. The assurance that he would have had sick pay if he had been ill is worth to him all the money he has had to pay for it, although that money itself has gone to pay other members who have been ill. It would seem hardly necessary to urge such an obvious truism: but the fact is that old and experienced members have been heard to claim credit for Friendly Societies as being a kind of philanthropic institution, to which members contribute for the benefit of others and not of themselves. There could not be a more ridiculous fallacy; every member contributes for his own benefit, and has just as much expectation when he makes the contribution of getting sick pay out of the contributions of the other members as the other members have of getting sick pay out of his contributions. A Friendly Society is a matter of business, not a charity, and is sound only so long as it is treated as a matter of business.

The next principle to be enforced is the principle of equity. We have supposed a case of 100 men of the same age. But suppose a case of a society having 100 men of the age of 30, 100 of the age of 40, 100 of the age of 50, and 100 of the age of 60, or so equally grouped above and below those ages respectively as to make that a fair representation of the constituents of the society. Now we have seen that the 100 men of 30 may expect 670 days of sickness in the year; but according to the tables the 100 men of or near the age of 40 will have 958 days; those of or near the age of 50 will have 1,525 days; those of or near the age of 60, 3,025 days. If all the men belonging to a society so constituted were to pay the same contribution, a contribution of 1*l.* 11*s.* would be required, or 2*s.* 7*d.* per month; but we have just seen that a man of 30 need only pay, to meet the risks belonging to members of his own age, 1*s.* 1½*d.* It is evident, therefore, that his contribution is 1*s.* 5½*d.* too much; but the amount that the man of 60 would have to pay to meet the risks belonging to those of his own age would be 3*l.* 0*s.* 6*d.*, or 5*s.* 0½*d.* per month. If, therefore, all the members pay the same contribution of 2*s.* 7*d.*, this man is paying 2*s.* 5½*d.* too little. Hence we see that liability to sickness increases with age; and that a uniform contribution for all ages is contrary to equity. It would be equally contrary to equity to charge a man who is healthy the same contribution as a man who is unhealthy

or a man who belongs to a dangerous occupation or lives in an insani-
tary dwelling the same contribution as other men of his age.

Up to this point we have considered the financial arrangements of a Friendly Society as if they were to last for one year only and then come to an end. This is the case with the dividing societies, and it has this disadvantage—that as the ages of the members increase, the liability to sickness must also increase, until the necessary contribution becomes more than they can afford to pay, and the society inevitably collapses, when its members are too old to join another.

This leads us to the third broad principle essential to the soundness of Friendly Societies—the principle of providence. A man entering a Friendly Society must not only provide for the sickness of the present year, he must provide for the sickness of future years. To do this, he must pay such a contribution each year as will not only meet all the sickness of that year, but will leave something over to provide for the increasing sickness that will, as we have seen, fall to his lot when he grows older. Space will not allow of our illustrating this at the same length as we have devoted to the previous points; but that is the less necessary, because the tables of contributions, carefully graduated according to age, locality, and occupation, which are to be found in the General Rules of the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows, the Ancient Order of Foresters, the Independent Order of Rechabites, and the other great Friendly Societies, supply all the information necessary. No better or more profitable exercise could be given to the student than the careful examination of these tables and of the statistics upon which they are founded. For the present purpose, all we need say is that a Friendly Society, to be sound in principle, must be permanent, and must look to the distant future of its members as well as to their immediate future.

And thus we come to the fourth broad principle—that of accumulation. All these tables are calculated upon the assumption that the money not wanted for the current year's sick pay must be invested at a certain rate of interest and accumulated to meet the growing sick pay of future years. Here arises one of the most important and one of the most difficult parts of Friendly Society management. You must so invest your money as not to get too little interest. If your tables are calculated upon the assumption that your money is to earn 3 per cent. interest, you must not be content with the safest investment in the world if it will give you only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. On the other hand, you must so invest your money as not to get too much interest. As the great Duke of Wellington is said to have observed, high interest always means bad security. You must not only get your full 3 per cent. interest, but you must always be sure of being able to get your money back when you want it. This is a subject which has greatly occupied the minds of the leaders among Friendly Society men for some years, and by means of combining the money

of several lodges or courts in district investment funds, lending them upon mortgage to members, and other measures, they have endeavoured to secure prompt investment and re-investment, a remunerative rate of interest, and the power of realisation at par, all of which are necessary, if the society is to fulfil the conditions of its existence. The policy of the managers of a Friendly Society should be directed towards obtaining a rate of interest somewhat higher than that contemplated by their tables, but not too high. If the tables are calculated at 3 per cent., they should try to get 4, which they could easily do with safety. This would enable them to build up a reserve fund, and would also leave a margin of profit, by which on the occasions of the periodical valuations of their liabilities and assets a surplus could be shown, available perhaps to increase the benefits granted by the society, perhaps to diminish the burden of the contributions.

Upon these four columns—average, equity, providence, and accumulation—rest the soundness and the prosperity of Friendly Societies. It is on these that the societies have built up the superstructure which has afforded shelter to so many in their rainy days of distress. May their reliance upon these principles ever be firmer and firmer, for the weakening of either one of the four would work the ruin of the edifice. So long as they all are strengthened and consolidated, it will stand four square to all the winds that blow.

E. BRABROOK.

HENRICUS R. VERSUS THOMAS BECKET

LINGARD gives the following account of the civil process of *Henricus Rex v. Thomas Becket*, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury.

It had been suggested that, as long as the name of St. Thomas of Canterbury should remain in the calendar, men would be stimulated by his example to brave the ecclesiastical authority of their sovereign. The King's attorney was therefore instructed (April 24) to exhibit an information against him; and 'Thomas Becket, sometime archbishop of Canterbury,' was formally cited to appear in court and answer the charge. The interval of thirty days, allowed by the canon law, was suffered to elapse; still the saint neglected to quit the tomb in which he had reposed for two centuries and a half; and judgment would have been given against him for default, had not the King, of his special grace, assigned him a counsel. The court sat at Westminster (June 11); the attorney-general and the advocate of the accused were heard; and sentence was finally pronounced, that Thomas, sometime archbishop of Canterbury, had been guilty of rebellion, contumacy, and treason; that his bones should be publicly burnt, to admonish the living of their duty by the punishment of the dead; and that the offerings which had been made at his shrine, the personal property of the reputed saint, should be forfeited to the crown. A commission was accordingly issued (August 11); the sentence was executed in due form; and the gold, silver, and jewels, the spoils obtained by the demolition of the shrine, were conveyed (August 19) in two ponderous coffers to the royal treasury. Soon afterwards (November 16) a proclamation was published, stating that, forasmuch as it now clearly appeared, that Thomas Becket had been killed in a riot excited by his own obstinacy and intemperate language, and had been afterwards canonised by the bishop of Rome as the champion of his usurped authority, the king's majesty thought it expedient to declare to his loving subjects, that he was no saint, but rather a rebel and traitor to his prince, and therefore strictly charged and commanded that he should not be esteemed or called a saint, that all images and pictures of him should be destroyed, the festivals in his honour be abolished, and his name and remembrance be erased out of all books, under pain of his majesty's indignation, and imprisonment at his grace's pleasure.¹

Lord Campbell, relying on Wilkins and Burnet, gives the following account:

Henry the Eighth, when he wished to throw off the authority of the Pope, thinking that as long as the name of St. Thomas should remain in the calendar men would be stimulated by his example to brave the ecclesiastical authority

¹ *The History of England* (ed. 1849), vol. v. pp. 108-110.

of the Sovereign, instructed his Attorney-General to file a *quo warranto* information against him for usurping the office of a saint, and he was formally cited to appear in court to answer the charge. Judgment of *oust* would have passed against him by default had not the King, to show his impartiality and great regard for the due administration of justice, assigned him counsel at the public expense. The cause being called, and the Attorney-General and the advocate for the accused being fully heard, with such proofs as were offered on both sides, sentence was pronounced that 'Thomas, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, had been guilty of contumacy, treason, and rebellion; that his bones should be publicly burnt, to admonish the living of their duty by the punishment of the dead; and that the offerings made at his shrine should be forfeited to the Crown.'²

This process and execution are now in their turn submitted to another process—viz. that of criticism, for the purpose of determining whether what Lingard, Campbell, and a host of writers assert ever took place. I propose to examine the question, and cite witnesses for and against.

It is well, at the beginning, to call attention to several points which we must separate clearly in each witness's statement: The actual trial, the removal of the bones from the shrine, the burning of the relics, the declaring that St. Thomas was no saint, but a traitor, and the consequent removal of his name from books and calendars.

Before examining our witnesses we must picture to ourselves the shrine of St. Thomas, in Christ Church, Canterbury. And fortunately we have the description left us by Erasmus, in his *Colloquies*, of his pilgrimage there with John Colet in 1514. As he visited Canterbury with a letter of introduction from the Archbishop of Canterbury, he had a favourable opportunity of seeing everything. From his description I take the following passages, which will help to localise the different relics:

To the choir you ascend by many steps, under which is a passage leading to the north. At that spot is shown a wooden altar dedicated to the Holy Virgin, but mean, and not remarkable in any respect, unless as a monument of antiquity, putting to shame the extravagance of these times. There the pious man is said to have breathed his last farewell to the Virgin when death was at hand. On the altar is the point of the sword with which the head of the most excellent prelate was cleft, and his brain stirred, that he might be the more instantly despatched. The sacred rust of this iron through love of the martyr we religiously kissed. Leaving this spot, we descended to the crypt. It has its own priests. There was first shown the perforated skull of the martyr; the forehead is left bare to be kissed, whilst the other parts are covered with silver. At the same time is shown a slip of lead engraved with his name, Thomas Acrencis. There also hang in the dark the hair shirts, the girdles and bandages with which that prelate subdued his flesh; striking horror by their very appearance, and reproaching us for our indulgence and our luxuries . . . (*In the sacristy*) There we saw the pastoral staff of St. Thomas. It appeared to be a cane covered with silver plate. It was of very little weight and no workmanship, nor stood higher than to the waist. (*There was no cross at the top*) . . . From this place, then, we were conducted back to the upper floor, for

² *The Lives of the Lord Chancellors, etc.*, vol. i. p. 95.

behind the high altar you ascend again, as into a new church. There, in a little chapel, is shown the whole figure of the excellent man, gilt and adorned with many jewels. . . . (*The prior came who*) appeared to me to be a man equally pious and judicious, not unskilful in the Scotian theology. He opened to us the shrine, in which what is left of the body is said to rest. (*Asked if he saw the bones, Erasmus replied*) That is not permitted; nor, indeed, is it possible without the aid of a ladder; but a wooden canopy covers the golden shrine; and when that is drawn up with ropes, inestimable relics are opened to view. . . . The least valuable portion was gold; every part glistened, shone, and sparkled with rare and very large jewels, some of them exceeding the size of a goose's egg. . . . Lastly, we were brought back to the sacristy; where was brought out a box covered with black leather; it was laid upon the table and opened (*and in it were linens used by the saint*).

We read, from other sources, that there were many other relics of St. Thomas venerated at Canterbury and elsewhere, which are not mentioned by Erasmus. In order to understand the following documents we, therefore, must distinguish four great relics of the martyr, as venerated in Christ Church: his body in the shrine; his head, or rather that portion of the skull that was cut off; part of the blood, brain, and fragments of bone which Gervase tells us were carefully collected and afterwards exposed; and his hair shirts, &c., with other secondary relics.

Our first witness as to the reality of the trial must necessarily be that of the citation itself and the sentence. These are to be found in Wilkins.³

(a) *The Citation.*

Henry, by the Grace of God, of England, France and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, and of the English Church Supreme Head. By the tenor of these presents we cite and call to our supreme Council thee Thomas, who wast formerly archbishop of Canterbury, to treat of the cause of thy death, with the scandal which thou hast committed against the King's own predecessors and the injustice by which thou hast arrogated to thyself the name of martyr etc. . . . Given at London 24 April 1538.

(b) *The Sentence.*

Henry, by the Grace of God, of England, France and Ireland King, of the English Church Supreme Head, etc. . . . (*As St. Thomas did not appear or send any representative, as the defender appointed by the Court alleges nothing to refute and reject the crime of rebellion, contumacy, treason and treachery, and seeing the sufficient proof of all things accused against him, etc., etc.*) . . . we judge and declare the said Thomas, formerly archbishop of Canterbury, is not, from this time forth, to be held as a saint nor to be called a martyr nor is mention to be made of him among good folk; his name and images are to be cast out of the churches; he is not to be named in the missals, books of prayers, calendars or litanies; and that he incurred the crime of treason, treachery, perjury and rebellion. And, as such, we command his bones to be taken from the tomb and publicly burnt, that, from the punishment of the dead, the living may learn to respect our laws and not to oppose themselves to our authority. *The King then confiscates all the wealth of the shrine.* 'Given at London, on the 11th of June, 1538, by the King in his Council.'

³ *Concilia*, vol. iii. p. 835.

Wilkins takes his narrative from a work of Chrystopher Henriquez, *Phoenix Reviviscens*, in which Girolamo Pollini's *Istoria ecclesiastica della Revolutione d' Inghilterra*, lib. iii. c. 42, is given as his authority. From the narrative, we learn that the citation was duly served on the saint in his tomb by a public officer who gave the certificate of service. Thirty days were allowed to elapse between the citation and the hearing. The sentence, Henriquez tells us, is taken from a book of Richard Hillyard's now lost. After the proclamation of the sentence on the 11th of June 1538, the King, on the 11th of August of the same year, commanded that the shrine should be despoiled; and on the 19th, a day sacred to S. P. N. Bernard (?), the saint's bones were publicly burned and the ashes scattered to the winds.

The next witness I bring in confirmation of the story is the bull of Paul the Third; and the story of this bull is not without interest. As we see, the citation, trial and execution is said to have taken place during a period from the 24th of April to the 20th of August 1538 (19th of August is an obvious slip for the 20th). Pope Paul the Third, on the 25th of October 1538, according to a Vatican MS. quoted by Baronius,⁴ held a Consistory, and announced to the Sacred College a new instance of Henry's cruelty and impiety. He, said the Pope, had commanded the body of St. Thomas of Canterbury to be burnt and the ashes scattered to the winds, and had despoiled the shrine of the numerous vessels of gold and precious stones. His Holiness, accordingly, appointed Cardinals Campeggio, Ghinucci, Contarini, and San Sisto to discuss and report on these things.⁵ The Pope was reported to say that he felt greater grief for the news about St. Thomas than for the defeat of the Christians by the Turks.⁶ The result of the cardinalitial commission was to reissue the bull of excommunication against Henry which, three years before (August 1535), Paul had drawn up but had not launched. To the already long catalogue of the regal iniquities, the Pope now added the late enormities, to wit that the King had exercised his cruelty on the dead. He had, for the greater contempt of religion, called the blessed Thomas himself to judgment (*in iudicium vocari*), and caused him to be declared contumacious and a traitor, ordered him to be exhumed and burnt, and his ashes cast to the winds. Not content with waging war on the dead, he had also confiscated the treasures of the shrine. The bull is dated the 17th of December 1538.

There are certain points about the bull that call for attention. Paul seems to have no doubt as to his facts. And the six weeks that elapsed between the announcement in the Consistory and the drawing up of the bull did not materially alter the case. He is emphatic about

⁴ *Annales Ecclesiastici*, vol. xxxii. p. 494.

⁵ Gairdner's *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry the Eighth*, vol. xiii. part ii. n. 684.

⁶ *Ibid.* 686.

the burning of the relics and the confiscation of the offerings at the shrine. But, in the bull, he speaks of the saint being also called to judgment, *in iudicium vocari*. Does this mean an acceptance of the story that the King had instituted a legal process against the saint? Lingard, in a note, holds that the bull is a decisive proof for the authenticity of the process, and quotes the very phrases *in iudicium vocari* as the argument. By the way, I may note that Pole, cardinal deacon of St. Maria in Cosmedin, who had been associated with Contarini, by Paul the Third, in the famous *Consilium delectorum Cardinalium* (1538) for the reform of the Church, was not included in the commission appointed in the Consistory, although he was then in Rome, and only left the city ten days after the date of the bull (the 27th of December 1538) to visit Charles the Fifth and Francis the First to get their consent to the publication thereof with the mutual promise of enforcing the bull with their secular arms. How Pole was played with and tossed from one sovereign to another, and how the bull was never actually published, do not enter into this narrative.

The next witness is Nicholas Sanders, who says :

St. Thomas Becket . . . was compelled to defend himself on earth again after so many generations and was found guilty of treason. The king, thereupon, forbade him to be regarded as a saint. Moreover, he made a decree by the Council that anyone who should either keep his feast or mention him in his prayers or call him a saint at all or should suffer his name to remain in the calendars, must be treated as a capital offender.⁷

Sanders was born in 1527, and wrote forty-seven years after what is said to have taken place when he was eleven years old. His phrase 'to defend himself on earth again' may be a reference to the judicial process, or may be a rhetorical form of the statement that his saintship was put into question.

Wriothlesley, who was a Londoner, and kept a chronicle, says under date of 1538—

And the bones of St. Thomas of Canterbury were brent (*burnt*) in the same church by the Lord Cromwell. They found his head whole with the bones which had a wound in the skull, for the monks had closed another skull in silver richly for people to offer to, which they said was St. Thomas' skull, so that now the abuse was openly known that they had used many years afore.⁸

Wriothlesley writes as a contemporary, and says nothing of the process, but only of the burning.

John Sleiden, in his *De statu religionis* (1555), says *sub anno* 1538 : 'King Henry took him (St. Thomas) out this year and burnt the relics of his body.'

Somner, Stowe, Holinshed, and Harpsfield all follow one another

⁷ *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism* (1585), Book i., cap. xvii.

⁸ *A Chronicle of England, etc.*, Camden Society, ed. p. 86.

in saying that the relics were burnt. Fuller, in his account, waxes merry over the 'bone-fire.'

While the *consensus* seems universal that, after the shrine was taken down, the bones were burnt, only a very few of these authorities refer, or seem to refer, to the judicial process whereby St. Thomas was declared a traitor and his bones ordered to be burnt. The truth is that all this story of a judicial process is a fable, and is based on an inexact knowledge of what really took place. Let me cross-examine the witnesses. The citation, narrative, and sentence are, as I have said, to be found in the works of Christopher Henriquez and Girolamo Pollini, and are based on a book of 'Eliardus.' Who were these worthies, and what means of information had they? Henriquez was a Spanish Cistercian who, in 1626, wrote a series of biographical notes of Cistercian writers of England and Spain, under the title of *Phoenix Reviviscens*. The book is published at Bruxelles, and is dedicated to the Conde Gondomar. For the citation, he quotes Pollini, and, for the sentence, *Eliardus* (Hillyard), who was secretary to Bishop Tunstall and wrote a now lost history of his own times which was evidently used in the Roman edition of Sanders in 1586. Pollini is more interesting, and brings us nearer to an English source. He was a Dominican of Tuscany, and brought out his *Istoria* at Rome in 1594. He dedicates it to Cardinal Allen. At once we get into touch with the traditions that existed among the English exiles on the Continent, and with Sanders in particular. But the documents of citation and sentence, on examination, show enough evidence in the first words to allow us to put them out of court altogether as mere forgeries, and clumsy ones too. They both begin in the same way: 'Henry, by the Grace of God, of England, France and Ireland, King,' &c. Now for documents purporting to be of the year 1538 the title of King of Ireland is fatal. It was not until the 23rd of January 1542 that Henry, by Act of Parliament, changed his style from 'Lord of Ireland' to 'King of Ireland,' making the country a 'Kingdom' instead of the 'Dominion' it had always been since Hadrian the Fourth gave it to Henry the Second. These documents, then, seem to have been devised for the purpose of giving a form and reality to what was a current report on the Continent.

* To these serious objections I must add others. In all the State Papers of the year 1538, in the large volumes published by Mr. Gairdner I can find no reference, in any authentic paper, to such a trial as being proposed, or as about to take place, or as having taken place. This is negative evidence, I admit. But in spite of the dates given for the desecration of the shrine and the burning of the bones—to wit the 19th (20th?) of August—we have positive proof that, for two weeks at least after this date, things at Canterbury were as they had been. Thus Cranmer writes to Cromwell, the 18th of August, 1538:

Farther by cause that I have in great suspect that St. Thomas of Canterbury his blood, in Christ's Church at Canterbury, is but a feigned thing and made of some red ochre or of such like matter, I beseech your lordship that Dr. Lee and Dr. Barlow, my chaplains, may have the King's Commission to try and examine that and other like things there.⁹

On the 1st of September, 1538, Madame de Montreuil and the French Ambassador visited Christ's Church; and, on that same day, Penison writes to Cromwell from Canterbury

that she was taken to see the shrine of St. Thomas at the which she was not a little marvelled of the great riches thereof; saying them to be innumerable, and that if she had not seen it all the men in the world could not have made her believe it. Thus overlooking and viewing more than an hour, as well the shrine as St. Thomas's head, being at both set cushions to kneel; and the prior opening St. Thomas's head saying to her three times, 'This is St. Thomas's head,' and offered it to her to kiss it, but she neither kneeled nor would kiss it but still viewing the relics thereof.¹⁰

We may therefore dismiss Henriquez, Pollini, and Hillyard as witnesses of no value as far as their documents and dates are concerned.

But now returning to the bull of Paul the Third, which was issued only three or four months after the desecration of the shrine, what are we to say to that account of the process? Turning to the words of the bull itself, I am inclined to ask, Does, as a fact, it state that any judicial process took place? I hold that the words *in iudicium vocari* have been taken wrongly to mean a judicial process. The real sense is that the King had presumed to sit in judgment upon one whom the Pope had canonised. The word *iudicium* is to be taken to refer to the effects of the King's act not to a formal manner of procedure by a trial *quo warranto*.

The next words, *et tamquam contumacem damnari ac proditorem declarari fecerat*, do not afford, as might appear at first sight, any argument against the interpretation I put on the *in iudicium vocari* which immediately precede them. For the phrase evidently comes from a mistaken idea of the meaning of a regal proclamation of the 16th of November 1538, about which more anon. I am, moreover, confirmed in my impression by the fact that, in the report of the Consistory of the 25th of October, Paul the Third, while saying that the relics were burnt and the shrine despoiled, is silent about any judicial process. If, then, the *in iudicium vocari* means anything more than a calling into question the saintship of the martyr, it must be the result of a misunderstanding of the proclamation of the 16th of November, which seems to be the only bit of extra evidence that came to the notice of the Holy See as the result of the cardinals' inquiry. To clinch the argument that the words of the bull do not mean an actual judicial process, I may mention that Pole, who was sent to Spain to

⁹ Gairdner, vol. xiii Part ii. n. 124.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* n. 257.

induce Charles the Fifth to support the bull and, moreover, wrote, a long account of the iniquities of Henry for this purpose, while referring to the proclamation, says not a word about any process. Nor can I find any reference to it in any of his letters. His silence is eloquent, for the fact of any process would have been an argument that Pole would use for all it was worth. For these and other reasons, I do not think it is necessary to dwell any more on the nature of this apocryphal process.

The Tutors, Henry specially, were always anxious to throw the appearance of legality over their doings. One has to look at probabilities in a strange course of action, and find some reasonable cause for an extraordinary procedure. Now, Henry was not one to go through a farce of a trial when he could get his end, more speedily and just as efficiently, by proclamation. Then, looking at the matter entirely from the other side, we must not forget that his actions would be represented at Rome in anything but the most favourable light. Besides, there would hardly be time at Rome to test the accuracy of all the reports between the period when we may reasonably presume that the destruction of the shrine took place and the official announcement in the Consistory; and without this it was quite possible for the real force of the proclamation to be misunderstood in every detail. For the destruction must have taken place at some date after the 1st of September, 1538, at which period, it is well to say, there seems to have been no suspicion at Canterbury that any such fate was about to befall the shrine. The dissolution of the monastery of Christ Church took place by degrees. It is bound up with the attack on the sanctity of St. Thomas. In the September, Cromwell in person went to Canterbury and held a visitation at Christ Church. This must have been before the 30th of September; for, in the State papers, there is a letter of that date from one of the monks, Richard Thornden, to Cromwell, saying 'that he and his fellows gathered from Cromwell's exhortation in their chapter house that they must change their habits; and he writes to know when this is to be done, as he must provide before All Hallows Day new habits for the convent.'¹¹ And on the 4th of November he again writes, 'Since your being at Canterbury many things fall to ruin.'¹² Cromwell evidently at this visit had decided upon the destruction of the shrine, and either left or sent Wriothesley to carry it out; for in a list of the King's payments for the month of September is the following entry: 'for so much money by him (Mr. Wriothesley) laid out in sending parcels by way of his Majesty's rewards unto sundry monks and chief officers of Christchurch in Canterbury and also to sundry servants and labourers travelling about the disgarnishing of a shrine and other things there, 23*l.* 16*s.*' We may take it for granted, therefore, that in its first form the only news that arrived at Rome just before the Consistory

¹¹ Gairdner, n. 405.

¹² *Ibid.* n. 749.

of October was that of the burning of the relics; the legal process, if the aforementioned words of the bull of December are to be taken as meaning or as hinting at such a thing, being an afterthought based, as I have said, upon the proclamation. But I have given reasons for holding that no such interpretation should be put on the bull at all. The Pope was right in the main statement of fact.

Let me now take the evidence for the burning of the relics.

(1) The assertion of Paul the Third in Consistory of the 26th of October, 1538.

(2) The bull of the 17th of December, 1538.

(3) The clear assertion of Cardinal Pole in his letter to Charles the Fifth: 'Verum ut postea hominis ossa (nihil enim hic amplius dicam) tot ante eum saeculis mortui erueret, igni traderet, in cinerem redacta per contumeliam postea in ventum spargeret,' &c.¹³

The same Pole, writing from Gerona the 16th of March, 1539, to the Constable of France, speaks in general of the saints in England having their bodies infamously torn from the tombs, burnt, and their ashes scattered to the winds and they called wretches and traitors.¹⁴ It is well to note that Pole extends the burning and defamatory declaration to all the saints whose shrines were destroyed.

(4) We have given the opinion of Wriothesley, Sleiden, Somner, Stowe, and Holmshed as to the fact of the burning. They repeat one another. Wriothesley's testimony is the strongest; but it must be remarked that he was not an eye-witness, but wrote down what was only the gossip of the town where had lately been witnessed the burning of the Rood of Boxley and other sacred images. We should remember the political capital made out of these acts, and the false stories greedily swallowed by a mob.

But, generally, when there is a definite statement coming from several independent sources there is a basis in fact; and here I think we can find such a foundation as will account not only for the error of Wriothesley, but also for the apparent mistake in the bull. There was a burning of a relic, or of a supposed relic, of St. Thomas at Canterbury by order of Cromwell; and from this comes the story that all the bones were burnt.

Let me remind the reader that, besides the bones of the martyr kept in the glorious shrine behind the altar, there was, at the altar in the crypt, the head of the saint, or at least that part of the skull cut off by the sword of De Tracy. This was the object of special reverence. Encased in silver, if it were only the part of the head, it, as happens in so many cases, was popularly called the 'Head of St. Thomas,' instead of its technical name, which, of course, would have been *ex capite S. Thomae*. Now, Wriothesley says that when the shrine was opened they found there the head. He adds (without giving any proof, be it remembered) that the head was 'whole with

¹³ Epistle vol. i. 66, § 23.

¹⁴ Gairdner, n. 536.

the bones which had a wound in the skull for the monks had closed another skull in silver richly for people to offer to which they said was St. Thomas' skull, so that now, the abuse was openly known that they had used many years.' In a document which I shall give in full it is officially stated 'that the head, 'almost whole,' was found in the shrine; what was kept in the crypt evidently was that piece of the skull struck off by De Tracy. Hence, I surmise that on opening the shrine, as the greater part of the skull was found there, the commissioners at once concluded, and were glad to conclude, that the relic of the head in the crypt was an imposition. This they burnt, perhaps as glad to put out of the way an inconvenient witness. A story always improves in course of travel, so the gossip ran, in London and elsewhere, that all the relics were treated in the same way.

On the Continent it was soon known that something had happened. Writing from Valencia on the 5th of October, 1538, to Cromwell, Thomas Knight says that anyone who seeks for news from England inquires what has become of the saint of Canterbury, but Mr. Wriothesley (N.B. *not the chronicler, but Cromwell's commissioner at the destruction*), who played a part in that play, 'had before sufficiently instructed me to answer such questions.'¹⁵ And Wriothesley himself, writing to the King from Brussels, on the 20th of November, relates how the Marquis of Barrow had complained that saints were burnt, and that in reply 'he declared in such wise the religion of your Majesty, the abuses of Canterbury, Boxley and other places, that he seemed much to rejoice at the one and detest the other.'¹⁶

Now we come to the Royal proclamation. It is dated the 16th of November 1538, and it seems most probable that it affected the bull of the 17th of December. In the proclamation, after making provision against heretical books, the observance of certain church ceremonies till the King pleases to change them, and married priests who are to be deprived and even imprisoned, the case of St. Thomas is decided.

Then, forasmuch as it appeareth clearly that Thomas Becket, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, stubbornly to withstand the wholesome laws established against the enormities of the clergy by the King's highness most noble progenitor, King Henry the Second, for the commonwealth, rest and tranquillity of this realm, of his forward mind fled the realm unto France and to the Bishop of Rome, maintainer of those enormities, to procure the abrogation of the said laws whereby arose much trouble of this said realm; and that his death, which they untruly called martyrdom, happened upon a rescue by him made: and as it is written, he gave opprobrious words to the gentlemen which thus counselled him to leave his stubbornness, and to avoid the commotion of the people, risen up for that rescue. And he not only called the one of them bawd, but also took Tracy by the bosom and violently shook him in such a manner as he had almost overthrown him to the pavement of the Church; so that, upon this fray

¹⁵ Gairdner, n. 642.¹⁶ *Ibid.* n. 880.

one of their company, perceiving the same, struck him, and so in the throng Becket was slain.

And further that his canonisation was made up only for the Bishop of Rome, because he had been a champion to maintain his usurped authority and a bearer of the iniquity of the clergy.

For these and for other great and urgent causes long to recite, the King's Majesty, by the advice of his Council, hath thought expedient to declare to his loving subjects, that, notwithstanding the said canonisation, there appeareth nothing in his life and exterior conversation whereby he should be called a saint but rather esteemed to have been a rebel and traitor to his prince and therefore his Grace straightly chargeth and commendeth that from henceforth the said Thomas Becket shall not be esteemed, named, reputed nor called a saint; but Bishop Becket—and that his images and pictures through the whole realm shall be put down and avoided out of all churches, chapels and other places. And that from henceforth the days used to be festival in his name shall not be observed; nor the service, office, antiphons, collects and prayers in his name read, but rased and put out of all the books. And that all other festival days, already abrogate shall be in no wise solemnised, but his Grace's ordinance and injunctions thereupon observed; to the intent his Grace's loving subjects should be no longer blindly led and abused to commit idolatry as they have done in times passed; upon pain of his Majesty's indignation and imprisonment at his Grace's pleasure."

It is remarkable that, in this document, not a word is said about any judicial proceedings, as one would naturally expect, had any taken place. Neither is a word said as to the burning of the bones. The destruction of the shrine and confiscation of the jewels were now an accomplished fact, and perhaps 'the King's Majesty, by the advice of his Council, hath thought it (*not*) expedient to declare to his loving subjects' anything about these two matters, covering them up under the general statement that St. Thomas was henceforth but Bishop Becket and no saint. Lingard, however, is inclined to think that the opening words, 'forasmuch as it appeareth clearly,' point to a judicial investigation. I see no grounds whatever for this conclusion. That there was some sort of investigation and a ransacking of old histories to make up a case for the proclamation is not only to be expected, but seems actually to have taken place. Such things are done now, when, under the pressure of controversy, it is necessary to make up a case. In the Record Office there is a Latin paper of ten pages made up of extracts about St. Thomas. This is probably (there is no date, though Mr. Gairdner includes it under the papers of August 1538) one of perhaps several efforts in the way of 'historical research' so useful to unscrupulous partisans. The perversion of facts as regards the cause and death of St. Thomas as set forth in the proclamation is, I submit, of no force against the strong negative argument to be deduced from the silence, otherwise inexplicable, of any reliable reference to a process or to the burning of the bones. Nay, I should argue otherwise, for the more established and well known facts Henry could proclaim, the more credibility he

could claim for his narrative as a whole. I may add that Henry seems to have been so proud of the historical part of his proclamation that, in the following month, he sent out to the justices of the peace a circular in which he says that the cause of the death was the defence of the liberties of the Church; 'these detestable liberties Becket traitorously demanded against the law of the realm.'¹⁸

We may, perhaps, get a nearer solution of the question of the burning by glancing at the treatment Henry meted out to the relics of other English saints whom he unshrined for the sake of their riches. Thus, for instance, at Winchester, the bones of St. Swithun were buried near the spot where the shrine had stood. Up and down the land there were many shrines of saintly bishops. What became, at Canterbury, of the bones of St. Augustine, St. Theodore, St. Anselm? Where at St. Paul's are the bones of St. Erconwald, at York of St. William, at Ely of St. Etheldreda, at Durham of St. Cuthbert, at St. Albans of the Protomartyr, at St. Edmunds of the Royal patron? We never hear that these were burnt; but we do know that some, and probably all of these, were buried secretly when they were unshrined. Why should the bones of St. Thomas have been treated differently from any of the others; and what good could be attained by so doing? Was it because he was declared a traitor? But the proclamation effectually unsainted him as far as a king could go. In this respect he was certainly treated exceptionally, and herein, as far as we have any proof, is the limit of the exceptions.

Some further light may be cast on the subject by a paper in the Record Office drawn up and corrected by Thomas Derby, Clerk of the Council and of the Signet. Mr. Gairdner includes it under the papers of 1539, and we may take it as being written after the proclamation or probably drawn up in reply to the bull. The paper is endorsed by Derby, 'a vindication of the changes recently effected in England.' No allusion is made to any judicial process, a charge which then probably had not been formulated. And this would go to show that in England, and notably in Henry's court, the words of the bull, *in iudicium vocari*, were not taken as meaning that a formal judicial process had been instituted. If, then, this document be a reply to the bull, it would seem evident that in England there was then no idea of any judicial process having taken place. This is the passage which here concerns us:

As for shrines, capses, and reliquaries of saints so called although the most were nothing less, forasmuch as his Highness hath found other idolatry or detestable superstition used thereabouts and perceived that they were for the most part feigned things, . . . His Majesty, therefore, hath caused the same to be taken away and the abusive pieces thereof to be burnt, the doubtful to be set and hidden honestly away for fear of idolatry.

As for the shrine of Thomas Becket, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury,

¹⁸ *Ibid.* n. 1171.

which they call saint Thomas, by approbation it appeareth clearly that his common legend is false; and that at the time of his death and long afore, he was reconciled to King Henry the Second, King of this realm, Duke of Normandy and Guyenne, and had no quarrel directly with him, but only against the archbishop of York which arose from proud pre-eminences between them; and by strife thereof procured forwardly his own death which they unduly call martyrdom.

After following the proclamation, as to the manner of death, it goes on :

and so in the throng Becket was slain; so that he never did act in his life sufficient to prove any holiness but came to be the King's chancellor by money, was a great warrior, a burner of towns, a croacher of benefices, a hunter and hawker; proud and seditious; by corruption and unlawful means obtained the Archbishopric of Canterbury as he himself confessed openly to Pope Alexander, and as by writings and chronicks of good record, by his chaplains and brethren the bishops of England made; and sundry of them about forty years printed in Paris and never reproved (although the mercy of God might be extended unto him) yet nevertheless it was asserted that his shrine and bones are therefore taken away and bestowed where they will cause no superstition *as it is indeed amongst others of that sort conveyed and buried in a noble tower.* And forasmuch as his head almost whole was found with the rest of the bones closed within the shrine, and that there was in that church a great skull of another head, but much greater by the three-quarter parts than that part which was lacking in the head closed within the shrine whereby it appeared that the same was but a feigned fiction, if this head was burnt, was therefore St. Thomas burnt? Assuredly it concludeth not.¹⁹

It now remains for me to piece together, as far as I can, what we really know of Henry's action towards St. Thomas.

St. Thomas was the most popular of all the saints revered in England. The cause that he was identified with was the popular one, and spelt 'liberty' in the minds of Englishmen. He was therefore naturally a stumbling-block in the way of Tudor despotism; and his shrine, the richest of all, was a tempting prize. Henry seemed to begin his operations against St. Thomas from afar off. There were two Feasts of St. Thomas celebrated in the year—the 7th of July, the day of the translation of the relics, and the 29th of December, the day of his death. Of these, the one in the summer was the more popular and attracted the greater number of pilgrims, and it was observed as a general holiday. Cranmer as far back as 1536 had sent out an injunction that this feast was to be "clean omitted, and instead thereof the ferial office used"; and an Act of Convocation in the same year put down all feasts and holidays that came in harvest time, viz. between the 1st of July and the 29th of September. In this way, without directly mentioning the Feast of St. Thomas, the popular holiday was put an end to by law. Cranmer was not behind-hand in refusing to keep the feast. The vigil had been observed

¹⁹ *Ibid.* n. 402.

as a fast day. At supper, on the 6th of July, he ostentatiously had meat served up at his table. It is probable that already the destruction of the shrine was contemplated and that some of the curious wits of the day were set to work to make up a case which could afterwards be set forward as the reason for 'putting down St. Thomas.' But whether Cranmer, in the August of 1538, knew what was determined upon I cannot say. His asking for a commission, to investigate the nature of the relic shown as the blood of St. Thomas, seems to point to the fact that he was not fully aware of what was intended. In the September, perhaps about the middle, Cromwell goes to Canterbury and holds a visitation. The events that followed from this visit were, the destruction of the shrine of St. Thomas in Christ Church, the burning of the relic of the head, and the burial of the bones in some secret spot. The dissolution of the neighbouring abbey of St. Augustine, with the destruction of its shrines, had already taken place. In the following November the regal proclamation came out, stigmatising St. Thomas as a traitor, unsainting him and ordering that all images and pictures of the 'blissful martyr' should be destroyed, ordering his feasts to be struck out of the calendar, and his name and services erased from the books. Some while after, when the story of the burning of the relics was spread abroad, 'the vindication of the changes recently effected in England' was drawn up.

If in these days false news be propagated, often wilfully, more easily could it be three hundred years ago, when the means of communication were slower. And, in spite of the telegraph, human nature is now, as it was then, always inclined to believe the worst and to act on that belief.

ETHELRED TAUNTON.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND THE EDUCATION BILL

THE action of the House of Lords on the Education Bill raises questions of grave constitutional and political importance, beyond even the issues of the Bill itself. How far, for instance, are they justified, after giving a second reading to a Bill and thereby accepting its main principles, in transforming and transmuting it into an alternative measure with different aims and objects? Can they expect the House of Commons to rediscuss in detail a Bill thus transformed? What again, judging from past experience, is likely to be the course of the House of Lords when the Bill, restored to its original condition by the House of Commons, is again returned to them?

Before answering these questions it may be well to deal shortly with some of the points arising in the proceedings of the House of Lords. The Bill in its original shape, as introduced by the Government, was in its leading principle a very simple one. It proposed to assimilate all existing denominational, and so-called voluntary schools, which are maintained out of public grants and rates, to the existing Council schools, the old School Board schools—schools where the broad principles of public control, the absence of religious tests for teachers, and undenominational religious teaching are fully maintained, with universal satisfaction to the public, and to parents of children. On this broad principle were grafted two great concessions to denominationalism—the one, that facilities should be granted in the transferred schools, two days a week, not at the public expense, for the teaching of the special religious doctrines prescribed by their existing trust deeds; the other, that in urban districts, where other schools are open to children, schools of a purely denominational character in the sense that substantially all the children belong to a particular religious sect, exception should be made, and that they should continue to be purely denominational. These two great concessions, which have fully secured religious teaching in the Church schools, as it is ordinarily given, have been the cause of all the complications and difficulties of the Bill. They have not conciliated opposition. It has been asserted even by bishops on public platforms, and sedulously

circulated in thousands of rural parishes, that the Bill abolishes all religious teaching in schools, and deals a deadly blow at Church teaching. The Bill, however, with these great concessions, which nearly wrecked it with the Nonconformists, was offered as a compromise to the Church of England and other denominations. It passed the House of Commons by immense majorities, greater than in the case of any other measure since the Reform Act of 1832, and came up to the House of Lords.

The Bill has there been treated in the most hostile spirit. It became at once apparent how enormously strong, active, and aggressive in that House is the High Church party, who hold that religious Bible teaching without dogma is useless or wholly insufficient, and how relatively weak is the other section of the Church of England. Not only is there not a single representative of the Nonconformists in the House of Lords, but the evangelical section of the Church, who as a rule are satisfied with simple Bible teaching in the schools, and have no proclivities to sacerdotalism, have been conspicuous by their silence in the House. The main motive power in framing and carrying amendments to the Bill has been the High Church party in combination with the Roman Catholic peers—a more influential body than was generally believed to exist in the Lords.

Their amendments were not confined to the maintenance and even the extension of dogmatic instruction in the denominational schools to be transferred under the Bill. They aimed also at subverting the undenominational system of the Council schools. This is directly opposed to the principles on which the Bill is founded.

I may here say that, protracted as the debates have become in Committee, they have been to me of very sustained interest, quite as much so as in any of the great measures which I have heard discussed in the House of Commons. The case for the Bill, in all its details, has been maintained with the greatest ability, and with the most complete knowledge of the subject by Lord Crewe. His speeches, though pitched in a key which would hardly be emphatic enough for the House of Commons, were characterised by perfect tact and temper, and by a subtle irony which was a very effective weapon against the solid phalanx opposed to him. It required no small courage to face these overwhelming forces, night after night, in so prolonged a discussion. He was admirably supported by his veteran leader, Lord Ripon, and by Lord Fitzmaurice, while behind him Lord Stanley of Alderley, with univalued knowledge as an expert, and with courage enough to meet the whole bench of bishops in argument, was of immense assistance.

On the other side the Duke of Devonshire, Lord St. Aldwyn, Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Cawdor (I refer to them in their order of influence on the debates on this subject) showed almost equal knowledge and debating powers, as was to be expected of them. The Archbishop of

Canterbury was *facile princeps* among his colleagues on the episcopal bench. He seemed to know better what he wanted than any other opponent of the Bill. He assumed the post of spokesman for the Church, though it is not certain that he had consulted many of his colleagues. He was on occasions impressive and eloquent. Many others on the episcopal bench and elsewhere in the House have taken an active part. If the House of Lords does not contain in its ranks peers of great eloquence, such as I recollect in my young days, when I heard from its bar such men as the then Lord Derby, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Ellenborough, the Duke of Argyll, and Bishop Wilberforce, it has many members of very high dialectical and debating power. The same change from eloquence to dialectics is to be noticed in the House of Commons.

As discussions went on, it became clear that there were two very distinct interests among the opponents of the Bill—the bishops and their lay supporters, Anglican and Roman Catholic; and the men of the world, ex-Ministers and members of county councils.

From a very early period of the Committee the Bill virtually passed out of the charge of the President of the Council into the hands of the Bishops and the Opposition. It seemed to me that they attempted a task which all Parliamentary experience has shown to be an impossible one, that of transforming a Bill, in its course through Committee, into one of different aims and objects, by means of a fluctuating majority, consisting of very different interests, of which now one and now another prevailed. All past experience has shown that a measure cannot be welded in Committee into a consistent and coherent shape, unless it is in charge of some one responsible for conducting it through the maze of debate and amendments.

The Duke of Devonshire, above all others of the peers, exercised a predominating influence, and on several occasions was able to put a drag on the wheel of clerical aggression; but sometimes he was away, and then the bishops had their way unrestrained. The result is a measure inconsistent and incoherent in its details, one founded on principles the exact opposite of those of its original framers, one which has already been unanimously condemned by those for whom it was intended as a remedy, and which cannot possibly be accepted as a settlement.

The resulting Bill is in fact an alternative scheme aiming at the support and extension of denominationalism, at its maintenance in the schools to be transferred, and its extension to the existing Council schools, hitherto free from it. The Archbishop, in his speech on going into Committee on the Bill, said that he had no wish or intention to wreck it by his contemplated amendments. He must be much wanting in parliamentary experience if he thinks that drastic amendments, such as have been carried at his instance and with his assistance, could have any other effect than that of destroying the Bill, except on the

assumption that he is prepared to jettison them wholesale at a future stage.

The Archbishop and his colleagues on the episcopal bench failed only in one of their most deadly blows at the Bill, aimed not in defence of the Church schools, but against the Council schools.

They proposed to extend the facilities for special doctrinal teaching to all religious sects equally, not only as regards schools to be transferred, but also as regards Council schools, regardless of the extraordinary breach of trust in respect of their own voluntary Church schools. This proposal was defeated by the Duke of Devonshire and Lord St. Aldwyn, though warmly supported by Lord Lansdowne, the leader of the Tory party. It would have resulted in confusion of the worst kind in every school in the country.

The Duke, having achieved this victory, left the House and did not return in the evening. In his absence the bishops carried the same vicious proposal for all schools in rural districts, whether transferred schools or Council schools. It would, if admitted, introduce denominationalism into about 1,700 Council schools. The Bishop of Oxford then succeeded in adding a proviso that such doctrinal teaching is to be on five days in the week, and not on two days only. There can be but one opinion as to the clause thus amended, that it is aimed at the undenominational system of the Council schools. It is a most dangerous amendment to the Bill, capable of easy extension in the future to all Council schools.

Without going further into the innumerable amendments which have been made on the Bill, it suffices to say that the Bill as altered must be looked at as a whole. It is a changeling. It is not what its framers wanted, or what the electors at the General Election asked for. It is difficult to see what purpose the bishops and their friends in the Opposition had in view in spending fifteen days in elaborating this alternative scheme. They have unnecessarily, as it seems to me, shown their hands. They have produced an impossible scheme, one which no Minister, even of a Tory Government, could venture to propose to Parliament. The production of such an alternative is the best testimony to the soundness and good policy of the scheme of the Bill. It may confidently be asserted that, given the main principles of the Bill—public control, absence of tests, equality as between children of all religious sects—no scheme can be devised so favourable to the Church of England, as that proposed by the Government.

Let us then consider by the light of past experience and precedent the constitutional position of the Bill thus altered. It need not be pointed out that there have been very numerous cases, since the passing of the Reform Act of 1832, where the House of Lords have fundamentally differed as to the policy of Bills sent up to them by the House of Commons. An examination of these cases has resulted in a list of about 100 of them. It may not be quite exhaustive;

on the other hand, it includes a certain number of duplicates, where Bills have been rejected more than once. Making allowance for these, they have averaged about two for every year that Liberal Governments have been in power during the seventy-four years. There have been no such cases in respect of public Bills where the opposite party has held office.

In these cases of difference the House of Lords, in the vast majority—in nine out of ten of them—have taken the course of rejecting the obnoxious Bills on their second reading. I have been able to discover only nine cases where they resorted to the alternative course of making drastic amendments to them, and returning them to the House of Commons. These drastic amendments in two cases only amounted to alternative schemes. In all the other cases, however, they were vital to the Bills concerned.

In view of the Bill now under discussion, and of the many others on their way to the House of Lords, where grave differences are certain to occur, it may be well to give the details of these cases.

1834. *The Bribery at Elections Bill*.—The House of Lords read the Bill a second time, and referred it to a Select Committee, where it was completely altered. On its return to the House of Commons Lord J. Russell said that the amendments were of so extensive a character as to render it almost entirely a new Bill. Mr. Warburton and Mr. O'Connell thereupon contended that the House could not consider the proposals of the Lords without going into Committee and passing through all the stages of a new Bill. They moved that the amendments be taken into consideration that day six months. Lord J. Russell agreed, and the Bill was dropped.

1835. *The Municipal Corporations Bill*.—This was one of the most important reforms ever passed by Parliament. The Bill, after passing the House of Commons by large majorities, was read a second time by the Lords. A number of drastic amendments were carried in Committee by majorities averaging about 120 to 30. On the return of the Bill to the House of Commons great indignation was expressed. The Government was strongly pressed to refuse to entertain the amendments. Lord John Russell, however, who led the Liberal party in the House, advised concession on minor points in the Bill, but insisted on all points which were vital. Mr. O'Connell, in a powerful speech, supported this. 'Is the Bill [he said] worth having, with these concessions? He was decidedly of opinion that it was. It swept away all the old leaven of the old corporations. Every self-elected body would be swept away,' and so on. All the more important of the Lords' amendments were rejected. The Lords gave way on them at the instance of the Duke of Wellington. It should be recollected that Lord Melbourne's Government had only come into existence a few months before, on the defeat of Sir Robert Peel's Government, by a majority of twenty-nine. The Liberal Government, therefore, was not in a very strong position.

1836. *The Municipal Reform (Ireland) Bill*.—This important measure proposed to extend to the close and corrupt borough corporations of Ireland the same reform that had been adopted in England. It was passed by the House of Commons by a majority of 307 to 243. The House of Lords read the Bill a second time without a division, but in committee completely altered its character so that it bore no resemblance whatever to the original Bill. Of 140 clauses, 106 were omitted; eighteen new clauses were added. All the corporations in

Ireland were to be abolished. A central commission in Dublin appointed by the Lord Lieutenant was to administer the towns in place of them. On the return of the Bill to the House of Commons Lord J. Russell protested that he could never agree to so reactionary a measure. He moved the rejection of all these amendments, but, in the hope of conciliating the Lords, he proposed to restrict the full concession of reformed municipal constitutions to the twelve principal towns of Ireland, and to deal partially only with the others. These amendments were rejected by the Lords, who insisted on their own by a majority of 220 to 123, including proxies. The House of Commons thereupon refused to entertain further the Lords' amendments, and the Bill was lost.

1869. *The Bill for Disestablishing the Irish Church.*—This measure had been the subject of direct appeal to the constituencies. It was passed in the House of Commons by a majority of two to one. The House of Lords had shown its hostility the previous year by rejecting a suspensory Bill by a majority of two to one. When the Bill came up to the Lords, the then-Archbishop of Canterbury, while strongly objecting to it, advised them to give it a second reading, and to try the effect of amendments. His speech saved the Bill, which passed by a majority of 179 to 146. In Committee, drastic amendments were carried by the Archbishop and others. The property of the Church was largely saved to it. The principle of concurrent endowment of Roman Catholic priests was incorporated. On its return to the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone denounced the Lords' amendments in a powerful speech, in which he said that the Lords were living up in a balloon. The amendments were rejected almost *en bloc*. On the Bill going back to the Lords, they insisted on the first of their rejected amendments by a large majority. Lord Granville thereupon moved the adjournment of the House. A political crisis seemed imminent. At this stage the late Queen wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, asking him to put himself in communication with Lord Granville, and endeavour to avoid a conflict between the two Houses. A conference took place between the Archbishop, Lord Cairns, and Lord Granville, and an arrangement was arrived at. The Archbishop and Lord Cairns agreed to give way on the Lords' amendments, and the Government agreed to add to the compensation secured to the Church the sum of about one million. With this exception the Bill passed almost in its original form.

1870. *The Irish Land Bill.*—After passing through Committee in the House of Commons by majorities of from 75 to 80, this novel and important Bill was read a second time in the House of Lords without a division. In Committee several very drastic amendments were made. One of them, moved by the Duke of Richmond and carried by 92 to 71, reduced the compensation to tenants. Another, carried by Lord Salisbury, reduced the limit of tenancies subject to the Bill from 100l. a year to 50l. a year. The Bill [he said] was the most detestable one he had ever seen, and he would have rejected the whole clause if he could. This amendment was expunged at the Report stage. The Duke of Richmond's amendment and others were disagreed to by the House of Commons, and were not insisted on by the Lords. The Bill eventually passed almost in its original form. The only serious amendment conceded was one rejecting compensation in the cases of eviction for non-payment of rent—the cause of grave troubles in later years; and repealed in 1881.

1871. *The University Tests Abolition Bill.*—After many years of opposition to this measure, mainly at the instance of the bishops, the Lords at last gave way, and read the Bill a second time. In Committee they inserted drastic amendments, exempting Heads of Colleges from the Bill, imposing new tests on tutors, and prohibiting governing bodies from making alterations in their statutes. The House of Commons summarily rejected these amendments. The House of Lords did not insist on them. Lord Salisbury proposed that they

should insist on the new tests for teachers, but was beaten on a division by 128 to 89. The Bill passed in its original form.

1872. *The Ballot Bill*.—This Bill, which had been rejected the previous year, was read a second time in the House of Lords without a division. Many most drastic amendments were inserted in Committee by majorities varying from 70 to 110. On the return of the Bill to the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone said that, considered as a whole, these amendments had the most vital effect on the Bill, and that it would be the duty of the Government to sacrifice the measure rather than assent to them. The House rejected all of them. On the return of the Bill to the House of Lords the amendments were not insisted on, with the exception of one limiting the duration of the Bill to seven years. This was retained by a majority of 117 to 58. The House of Commons gave way on this point rather than lose the Bill. The Act has since been made permanent with general assent.

1881. *The Second Irish Land Bill*.—This most important, difficult, and even most revolutionary Bill that has ever been passed by Parliament, occupied the House of Commons for fifty-eight sittings. The second reading was carried by 352 to 176 votes. In the House of Lords it was read a second time without a division, Lord Salisbury, as leader of the Tory party, saying that, in view of the prevailing agitation and anarchy in Ireland, he would not recommend his followers to reject it, but rather to apply themselves in Committee to the removal of its glaring injustices. In Committee many drastic amendments were carried by majorities of about three to one, which fundamentally changed the character of the Bill. On the return of the Bill to the House of Commons these amendments, where involving points of principle, were summarily rejected by majorities of two to one in three long sittings. Though the House of Lords in reply showed a disposition to reject any compromise, yet ultimately they gave way on every point but two. They maintained the right of access of landlords to the Land Court. They insisted on the principle that judicial rents should not be reduced by a consideration of the amount paid by tenants for tenant right. These two matters were conceded by the Government, but it was maintained that in spite of them the Bill carried out fully the original intention.

1882. *The Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill*. The House of Lords read the Bill a second time without a division, but inserted in Committee a clause making the remission of arrears dependent on the consent of the landlord. This was carried by a majority of 169 to 98. It made the Bill inoperative and useless. The House of Commons rejected the amendment by 293 to 157. On the return of the Bill to the House of Lords there was a revolt on the Tory side of the Irish peers. They were only too glad to get a part of the arrears of rent due to them out of public money, even at the sacrifice of part of what was owing to them. Lord Salisbury was compelled to give way. He declared the Bill to be a most pernicious one, and an act of robbery. 'If I had the power,' he said, 'I would have thrown out the Bill; but, finding myself in a minority, I shall not divide the House.' The Bill passed in its original form.

I need not say that I have not referred to the very numerous cases in which the House of Lords have made amendments in Bills before them, not vital to their principles, and of more or less serious character. I have referred only to cases where the amendments were drastic and which, if accepted, would have been fatal to the measures concerned.

It will be seen that in no one of the nine cases did the House of Commons accept the drastic amendments sent down to them by the

Lords. In the eight Bills returned to the House of Lords, with disagreement to all the really important and vital amendments, that House, on reconsideration, with one exception only, did not insist on them, though in some cases they were able to obtain some minor amendments by way of compromise. Looking broadly at the above cases, it would seem that the resort to drastic amendments was either due to the efforts of astute leaders in the House of Lords to dissuade their more hot-headed followers from voting against the second reading of Bills which they knew were desired by the country; or else that they were proposed in the hopes of obtaining some minor concessions by way of negotiation and bargain.

I will not pursue the ultimate fate of the far more numerous measures which were rejected by the House of Lords. It may be noted, however, that with rare exceptions these rejected measures have since, directly or indirectly, been admitted. The four exceptions still remaining unreversed are the Bill for the Abolition of the Lord Lieutenantancy in Ireland, 1850; the Home Rule Bill, 1893; the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 1894; and the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, of perennial rejection. Of the other rejected Bills, two are of interest, as pointing to the possibility of the Government dealing with the education question in some other way, in the event of the Bill now before Parliament being defeated. In 1860 the House of Commons passed, as part of the Budget of the year, a Bill for the repeal of the Paper Duties. It was rejected by the House of Lords by a majority of 193 to 104. In the following year clauses for the repeal of the Paper Duties were inserted in the General Finance Bill. The House of Lords found itself precluded by constitutional practice from amending the Bill by striking out these clauses.

In 1871 the House of Commons carried a Bill through all its stages, after most prolonged and vehement opposition, for the abolition of the system of the sale and purchase of commissions in the Army. The House of Lords rejected the Bill by a majority of 155 to 130. The Government then at once availed itself of the authority of the Crown, and by Royal Warrant abolished the system of purchase of commissions. At the same time they again submitted to the Lords the Bill providing for compensation to officers for the change effected by the abolition of purchase. The House of Lords, finding themselves unable to defeat the administrative act of the Government, were compelled to pass the Compensation Bill. But they carried a vote of censure on the Government by a majority of 184 to 80.

What, then, by the light of experience and of these precedents, will be the fate of the Education Bill? It is possible that some of the worst features of the Bishops' amendments may be toned down at the Report stage, before this article is in print; but it is not likely that any complete re-transformation can take place at that stage. Judging by the above cases, and by the known temper of the present

House of Commons, it is most probable that the Commons will follow the course it did in most of the cases referred to, and will reject *en bloc* the Lords' amendments. The Bill, as altered in Committee of the Lords, is practically a new one. To discuss in detail the amendments, which have taken the House of Lords in Committee fifteen days to elaborate, would require as many, if not more, days in the Commons. It might well be argued, as in the case of the Bribery at Elections Bill of 1835, that it should pass through all its stages in the Commons. It seems more probable, however, that the amendments will be summarily rejected, with the exception of some few which were agreed to by Lord Crewe. The Bill will then go back to the Lords. It is at this juncture that the real crux will occur.

If we are to judge by the past experience of the cases I have referred to, we may reasonably expect that the Lords will not, at the last moment, insist on their drastic amendments. As in all these cases, the reasons, which deterred the Lords from rejecting the Bill on second reading, will equally deter them from insisting on amendments which will defeat it. We may well suppose that negotiations, similar to those which saved the Irish Church Bill in 1869, will again take place. A few leading men of both parties will perhaps meet in conference, and learn for the first time what is the minimum which the one party will demand, and the maximum which the other will concede. It is possible that an agreement will then be arrived at. As in the Irish Church Bill and others, it must be a condition that the Education Bill shall be restored to its original state. The concessions cannot be many or very important. The difficulty is that so many concessions have already been made that there is little room for more without destroying the structure of the Bill. There are, however, a few which can be conceded without this effect.

It will be asked, how is it possible for the Archbishop and his episcopal and lay wreckers to surrender the work of so many days in Committee? It will be no more difficult for them to do so than it was for Archbishop Tait in the Irish Church Bill, or for the late Lord Salisbury and the peers generally in the other cases.

The overthrow of their cause will not come from the Liberal party, but from the main body of lay Tory peers in the House of Lords. It has been made clear in the proceedings in Committee that a majority of them follow the Duke of Devonshire and Lord St. Aldwyn, and are not harnessed to the bishops.

The questions with these lay peers, at the last stage of the Bill, will be whether it is worth while to provoke a conflict with the House of Commons on a question which was so clearly before the constituencies at the General Election? Whether, so much in principle having been conceded, it is wise to risk a conflict over details, however important? Whether the alternative scheme, which has been elaborated mainly

by the Bishops, is a practical and workable one? Whether the Tory party, if returned to power, could undertake the passing of any such measure? Whether, if the Bill is rejected at this stage, it is probable that such good terms as those contained in the original Bill will ever again be offered to the Church by the Liberal party? Whether there is not danger that the next Bill will be in the direction of secular education? Whether it would not be possible for the Government, if their present Bill fails, to accomplish their main purpose in some more simple manner in the direction indicated in the case of the Paper Duties and the Abolition of Purchase, and without some of the concessions contained in the present Bill? Whether in view of many other Bills coming before the House of Lords it will not be better to defer their conflict with the House of Commons for even more disputable measures? For my part I feel little doubt as to how these questions will be answered by the practical statesmen who will have at the final stage to advise the action of the Tory party. The only question is whether they will carry the majority of their party with them.

As regards the Bishops, they may perhaps find some consolation in the *Life of Archbishop Tait*, by his successor and relative, the present Archbishop. They will learn from it that Archbishop Tait had to swallow a bitter pill when compelled to give way on the Irish Church Bill, and to surrender his cherished amendments.

He wrote in his diary on the occasion :

'We have made the best terms we could, and thanks to the Queen a collision between the two Houses has been avoided; but a great occasion has been poorly used, and the Irish Church has been greatly injured, without any benefit to the Roman Catholics.'¹

Experience has shown that the Irish Church has not been injured, but the very reverse, as everyone now admits. It is also fully recognised that the Archbishop acted the part of a wise and far-seeing statesman. It is his principal claim to fame in history. The present Archbishop sums up the case for him in these words, which we may hope will be applied in the future with equal justice to himself in connection with the Education Bill :

'It was in the capacity of a wise Christian statesman, rather than of a champion of ecclesiastical battlefields, that Archbishop Tait in this matter made memorable his occupancy of St. Augustine's chair.'²

EVERSLEY.

¹ *Life of Archbishop Tait*, vol. ii. p. 42.

² *Ibid.* p. 3.

WHAT WILL THE LORDS DO?

It is impossible to say what form the Education Bill will have taken by the time that these lines are in print. The process of what is called amending the Bill in the House of Lords misleads the closest observer, as it baffles description and defies analysis. Lord Salisbury appealed to the Peers the other day as a 'common-sense and businesslike assembly.' While he was speaking there were, on a moderate computation, three amendments before the Committee. When the Chairman put the first question, he put it in a form which nobody seemed to understand. At all events no peer left the House to divide. Thereupon he put from the Chair the question that words should be inserted, not, as before, that words proposed to be left out should stand part of the clause, and then, at last, the division was taken. The Chairman, Lord Onslow, is much to be pitied. He has absolutely no authority of any sort or kind. He cannot call a peer to order, or rule that an amendment is irregular. On one occasion, after a debate had lasted for two hours, he was asked what they were debating. 'The insertion of words which have already been inserted,' he replied. No 'common-sense' and businesslike assembly would tolerate such a system for a day. For a legislative body without a real Chairman is a mob, and a mob which wastes more time than it can usefully employ. Quite apart, however, from the rules of the House, or rather from the fact that there is nobody to enforce the rules, the Opposition, the Conservative majority, seem to have no plan of campaign. Their titular leader, Lord Lansdowne, is unfamiliar with the subject, and, like Mrs. Gamp, 'seeks not to protigipate, but takes things as they comes and as they goes.' Lord St. Aldwyn, who does know the Bill and its effect as a whole, is too moderate for the rank and file, though he ought to be, and probably soon will be, their Leader. The Archbishop of Canterbury, whose words are smoother than oil, does draw up batches of denominational amendments, or at least moves them, remarking from time to time that they are as beneficial to Non-conformists as to Churchmen. But he does not carry all the Bishops with him, some being, like the Bishop of Hereford, Liberals, and others, like the Bishop of Birmingham, preferring to follow Lord Halifax down the broad road. The Duke of Norfolk leads a little

band of Catholic peers, among whom by far the ablest debater is Lord Ilandaff. The mass of Tories seem, if their opinions may be inferred from their votes, to think that the country at the General Election pronounced for sectarian teaching on the largest scale at the public expense, for the right of all priests or clergymen to enter elementary schools whenever they please, and for the maintenance of ecclesiastical tests as a barrier against Nonconformist teachers. The Archbishop of Canterbury appears further to regard free education as a failure, and to support the reimposition of school fees. It is, however, likely enough that many peers do not at this stage of the proceedings trouble themselves about the country at all, but think that they know much better what is good for the people than the people themselves. As for the House of Commons, they affect to despise it, and Lord Amptill, whose name is Russell, protested against the mention of such a place.

The Government are as powerless in the House of Lords as the Chairman himself. Lord Ripon nominally leads the House, and shows a vigour which is wonderful in a man of his age. When he warned the majority against the danger of losing all securities for denominationalism by their mutilation of the fourth clause, 'speaking not only as a member of the Government, but as a Roman Catholic,' he made an impression even upon the benches opposite. But you cannot argue against numbers. Logic and reason and prudence are wasted upon an incoherent agglomeration, recognising no leader and accepting no advice. Lord Crewe's inexhaustible patience, unfailing courtesy, and complete mastery of the Bill which he conducts have been acknowledged on all sides. But he might as well talk to the Carlton Club or the Primrose League. The Bishop of London is reported, I hope untruly, to have made the remark that the House of Lords were doing God's work. The majority of them are doing the work of their own political party, and taking their revenge for the General Election. The constitutional tangle is really hopeless, for the British Constitution is a crank machine, and can only be managed in a reasonable spirit. One of its unwritten laws is that a Government which has a majority in the House of Commons must have also the control of legislation. If the House of Commons treated a Ministerial measure as the House of Lords are treating the Education Bill, the Ministry would come to an abrupt and speedy end. No hostile vote, and no number of hostile votes, in the House of Lords have the slightest effect upon the position of Ministers. A vote of censure passed by the Lords has no result of any kind. But they can, of course, legally prevent the passage of any Bill, and they can alter it, unless it be a Money Bill, out of all possible recognition. They can make it, as they have made this Bill, more clerical and sacerdotal than that which it was designed to supersede. This course amounts to saying, in tolerably plain terms, that the decision of the country shall be reversed within a year by an hereditary and irresponsible

Chamber. If that task can be successfully accomplished, then the election of a House of Commons is, as Lord Ampthill evidently thinks it to be, a farce. It is at least as true as it was when Mr. Gladstone coined the expression, nearly forty years ago, that the Lords are 'up in a balloon.' Moreover, it must be remembered that a great event has happened since then. The Lords boldly rejected the second reading of the Home Rule Bill in 1893, and the General Election of 1895 justified their vote. That for some years after 1895 the position of the Lords was greatly strengthened cannot in fairness be denied. Perhaps Mr. Gladstone could not have acted otherwise. At any rate, that was his own opinion. But the result was that when he retired from office in 1894 he left the Lords more powerful and more popular than they had been at any former period of his public life. The Government of 1892, though strong in the ability of its members, was in every other respect the weakest of modern times. It had no English, and no British, majority in the House of Commons. The Irish party on whom it depended were at variance among themselves. The Home Rule Bill was altered in Committee by a most unpopular amendment which would have enabled Irish members to vote on English and Scottish Bills at Westminster. As the Duke of Devonshire frankly told them, the Lords ran no risk by rejecting in such circumstances a great constitutional change, and they rejected it. Is there any parallel between those times and these? The Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and the Education Bill of Mr. Birrell, are supported by the largest British majority returned since 1833. Although the Irish Nationalists voted against the second and third readings in the House of Commons, these stages were carried by two hundred votes. The Lords discreetly read the Bill a second time without a division, and went with the same unanimity into Committee. To wreck it in Committee after thus accepting its main principles is not the fair play and honest dealing which are expected in English politics. Some such operation the Lords did perform upon the Parish Councils Bill in 1894. That, however, is not an encouraging precedent for them. For the House of Commons rejected all their important amendments, and, with one exception, they did not insist upon them. And that, be it remembered, was under the feeblest possible Government, the Government of 1892. In the same year 1894 the Lords did cause the abandonment of the Employers' Liability Bill by adhering to an amendment of their own. But it was not a wrecking amendment, and the better opinion now is that the Cabinet would have done well to accept it. If Mr. Birrell proposed to agree with one tenth part of the amendments made in this Bill, he would not carry his own party with him in the House of Commons. The House of Commons is a patient, long-suffering assembly. But nightly insults continued week after week will pierce the hide of a rhinoceros.

What has been the history of the House of Lords since 1895? Since 1895 the House of Lords has had no history. It has sat to register the decrees of one too powerful subject, first Lord Salisbury and then Mr. Balfour. People who shudder at the notion of a single Chamber are quite content to live under a single Chamber for ten years. So much more powerful are names than facts. In 1896 Mr. Balfour failed to carry through his own House of Commons an ambitious and unpopular Education Bill. In 1897 he appeased the clergy by a measure which gave them more money for their sectarian schools. Being a Money Bill, the Lords could not amend it, and it passed as it was brought in. At the General Election of 1900 that and everything else were forgotten, except the South African War. Those were the days (it seems hard to realise them) of crystallised telegrams, and the Mayor of Mafeking, and 'every vote given to a Liberal is a vote given to the Boers.' Lord Salisbury's Government retained their majority, and it seemed as if a Liberal Administration were about as likely, in Sydney Smith's phrase, as a thaw in Zembla. Once more Mr. Balfour introduced an Education Bill, and this time he put the denominational schools on the rates. Now I have never believed in the doctrine of the mandate. Even the word is un-English, and the theory is the invention of French Jacobins who avowedly wished to make their deputies animated automata, voting machines. Such an object, if it could be achieved in this country, would be totally subversive of the British Constitution, of Lords and Commons alike. But at the same time it has always been held by champions of a Second Chamber, especially our own, that the Lords should not lightly assent to a far-reaching change of principle on which the opinions of the electors had never been asked. It was certainly no part of the Ministerial platform in 1900 that schools under private management should have the same assistance as Board schools from the rates of the county or borough. But the Lords did not pause or hesitate. They passed the Bill substantially as it was sent them, though they actually inserted by a trick a clause which added to the burden on the rates and which the Speaker, if he had understood it, would have refused to put as a breach of privilege. The principles of the present Bill were discussed on almost every platform at the General Election, and almost every Liberal candidate expressed his belief in them. Those who gave Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman his majority knew that they were voting to abolish the distinction between council schools and voluntary schools. They voted for popular control over both, and for the abolition of religious tests for teachers. A vast amount of nonsense is talked and written about these tests. May not, it is said, a local authority ascertain the competence of religious teachers, as of secular teachers, by suitable means? Of course they may, and must. A man's knowledge is sifted, and very properly sifted, before appointment. Nor is it immaterial to inquire what

previous experience he has had, and how he employed it. But his opinions are his own secret, and any attempt to get at them must of necessity be futile. Fortunately, it is also quite needless. An honest man or an honest woman will not desire to teach a religion they do not believe. A dishonest person who wished to teach religion would at once answer all questions in the affirmative. That is the root of the whole matter, and the matter can never be understood without it. Another point of which the truth is habitually shirked or slurred is the alleged right of the parent. Nothing was heard of this right when clerical schools were put upon the rates in 1902. Nothing was ever heard of it until it was invented as a ground of opposition to this Bill. The Bishop of Birmingham put it to the House of Lords the other day with refreshing simplicity. 'We,' said his Lordship, speaking as a parent, 'we claim the right of having our children brought up in our own religion.' Of course the Bishop of Birmingham is not a parent, and the real parent, except in petitions manufactured by the National Society, makes no such demand. The Bishop of Birmingham wants to inculcate his own dogmas, such as the deplorable character of the Reformation, upon other people's children, and that he calls exercising the rights of a parent. But now let us suppose that the right is conceded, and that an Atheist or an 'Agnostic' seeks to take advantage of it. What would the Bishop of Birmingham say to him? Would he say, 'My dear sir, it is true that you, like myself, pay rates and taxes for educational purposes. Moreover, you have children and I have none. But really your views are of such a distressing and injurious nature that they cannot possibly be taught at the public expense'? But unfortunately many people, and even many Churchmen, think the Bishop's own views far from satisfactory. So perhaps he will see that it won't do. 'Facilities all round,' or 'all-round facilities,' as they say in the House of Lords, are hopelessly impractical—a fond thing vainly invented, as the Articles say. What the Bishops call Cowper-Templeism, and other people call Christianity, is the only religion which can fairly be taught in this country at public elementary schools. It satisfied for thirty years, it satisfies still, the enormous mass of Protestant parents, Churchmen and Nonconformists alike. It does not satisfy Catholics or Jews, for whom special provision is made in the Bill. If in many cases it satisfies freethinkers, what a tribute to Christian morality! 'We can set before ourselves,' said John Mill, 'no higher standard than so to live that Christ would approve our life.' Let it never be forgotten that there is no such thing as 'Cowper-Temple religion.' But there is a Christian religion at which, in its simple essence, those who attack 'Cowper-Templeism' are really directing their taunts and jeers. The Education Bill, at the moment of writing, is impossible. On report the Lords may restore it to a practical shape, and if the Duke of Norfolk takes a division against the third

reading he is not likely to find many supporters. In what shape it will return he would be a bold man who should with any confidence predict. Mr. Birrell showed by chapter and verse in his speech to his own constituents at Bristol that the Lords had substituted for his Bill, the Bill of the Government, a measure so clerical and reactionary that neither Mr. Balfour nor any other Minister would have dared to propose it in any conceivable House of Commons. The first Lord Alington, Gerard Sturt, a shrewd Tory squire, said more than twenty years ago that when the House of Commons came into conflict with the House of Lords, he had never known the House of Commons give way.

The Trade Disputes Bill, now also before the Lords, once raised a storm in a teacup which some antique professors still regard with apparent interest. Not the least remarkable feature in its recent history has been the conversion of Mr. Balfour. The leader of the Opposition originally objected to the whole Bill, and especially to the clause which exempts the funds of trade unions from liability in damages for the acts of their agents. Mr. Balfour's mind has one weak spot. He cannot apprehend, or he finds it very difficult to apprehend, the bearing of a legal proposition. To expect that a professor of law should be a lawyer would be silly. But that Mr. Balfour, accustomed all his life to the exercise of dialectic, and surpassing in command of it almost everybody else, should often lose his way in forensic discussion, is strange. Yet it is so. For a long time nobody, on either side of the House, could make him see that a trade union is not a corporation. When at last that had been driven into him, he argued that the Bill conferred upon trade unions an immunity not enjoyed by a number of other unincorporated bodies. An able and very independent lawyer on the Liberal side of the House, Mr. Wallace, said, 'Name one.' 'Does the learned gentleman,' asked Mr. Balfour, 'really mean that there are none?' 'Yes,' was the rejoinder, and Mr. Balfour accepted the correction with his usual courtesy. It is the judgment of the Law Lords in the Taff Vale case that made an exception against trade unions, not the Bill that makes an exception in their favour. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the privilege restored to the unions who were universally regarded as possessing it for a generation is expressly and in terms extended to associations of masters, whose powers will be considerably, some think dangerously, enlarged by this measure. The notion that the Bill affects the law of libel, or applies to agrarian combinations like the Plan of Campaign in Ireland, is chimerical. No human being can predict what an eccentric judge may read into the words of a statute divorced from their context. But the Speaker, who is a far better authority than most judges, declared that if he were sitting in a court of law he should not hesitate to treat agrarian disputes, not, of course, agricultural strikes, as entirely outside the Act. Perhaps I may be forgiven for taking an historical view of this subject. When

in 1867 abominable crimes and outrages, committed by small trade unions, chiefly in Sheffield, were dragged to light, neither party in the State succumbed to unworthy panic. Lord Wemyss, then Lord Elcho, carried a Bill which gave a workman the same remedy against his master as his master had against him. Sir William Erle's Commission, under whose auspices the disclosures at Sheffield were made, issued a valuable and statesmanlike report from which proceeded the Liberal Act of 1871, followed by the Conservative Act of 1875. Since that time trade unions have increased as much in self-restraint as in power, and all reasonable Englishmen, whatever their politics, are proud of these English organisations. The epilogue of this drama was fitly spoken by Mr. Balfour just before the House of Commons read the Bill a third time *nemine contradicente*. Gracefully ignoring his previous antagonism, he treated the measure as uncontroversial and hinted quite unmistakably that as there was no longer any opposition the House of Lords could not be expected to undo what the House of Commons had done, and the empty benches behind him added significance to his words. An outburst of Eldonian Toryism from Lord Halsbury is due, perhaps overdue. But Mr. Balfour must be taken to have spoken for Lord Lansdowne, and the Bill must be regarded as safe.

Of the remaining measures that will be sent to the Lords before Christmas the most important is the Plural Voting Bill. The principle of 'one man, one vote' is nauseously familiar, and need not therefore be explained. Mr. Chamberlain used to argue, with some force, that if anyone was to have plural votes it should be the poor man, who cannot protect himself, not the rich man, who can. Our law does not give a man voting power in proportion to his wealth, but as his estates are scattered about the country. That a landowner who has property in half a dozen counties should have a voice in choosing every County Council which can rate him is fair enough. There are as many County Councils as there are counties; indeed, there are more. But there is only one House of Commons, and concentration need not be discouraged by partial disfranchisement. There is really nothing to be said against the principle of this Bill, which does not raise, however remotely, either redistribution or woman's suffrage. About the method adopted by the Government for carrying it out there is more room for difference of opinion. The most obvious proposal would have been that every man should vote where he resided. But then where does he reside? He may live half the year in London, and half the year in the country. Perhaps, therefore, on the whole the plan of the Bill, which requires every voter registered in more than one constituency to make his election where he will exercise the suffrage for the future, is the simplest and most satisfactory. Certainly Mr. Harcourt has piloted his Bill with great dexterity, and shown a great deal of his father's aptitude for Parliamentary

debate. Although the passing of this measure is not likely to strengthen the forces of Conservatism, it is too exclusively connected with the House of Commons for the opinion of the Lords upon it to have much weight.

The problem of the moment is of course the Education Bill. Before the next number of this Review appears, the greatest constitutional struggle since the first Reform Bill will in all probability have been determined. I make no prediction. But even those who do not usually take much interest in the *Court Circular* will have observed that the Prime Minister and the Archbishop of Canterbury spent Sunday the 18th of November at Windsor Castle. In the Archbishop's Life of his father-in-law and predecessor, Dr. Tait, will be found a long, elaborate, and interesting account of Tait's efforts to reconcile the two Houses when the Irish Church was disestablished in 1869. Then, as now, the mass of moderate or Liberal Churchmen who supported the Bill were told by a noisy clerical minority that they were no Churchmen at all. Then, as now, they treated the accusation with frigid disdain. But there are very few lay Churchmen who would deny that the Bill had been a blessing to Ireland, to her relations with Great Britain, and to the Church itself. Money was the real trouble in 1869, as in 1906, and the terms of compensation were finally settled by Lord Granville and Lord Cairns, of whom perhaps the best modern representatives are Lord Ripon and Lord St. Aldwyn. The only man who has hitherto exercised any appreciable influence over the Peers is the Duke of Devonshire. The Duke does not like the Bill, and he was of course responsible for the Act of 1902. But he understands that the Cowper-Temple clause is the foundation of elementary teaching in this country, and he understands also the House of Commons. It would, I conceive, be possible for the Government to agree that the fourth clause should be compulsory, and not confined to urban areas; that the majority of parents required should be three-fourths, not four-fifths; that the committee of parents should have the right of recommending teachers to the local authority; that religion should be replaced in the position from which Sir William Anson displaced it; and that teachers who have already given denominational instruction should continue to give it after the passing of the Bill. If they went much beyond that, they would betray their supporters and endanger themselves. The real decision is with the Lords, and a great many Liberals, of whom I am not one, hope that they will be unwise.

HERBERT PAUL.

*The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY cannot undertake
to return unaccepted MSS.*

